





The Rambler.

PART XLIII.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR IRELAND	1
STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE RE- FORMATION	12
PASSION, LOVE, AND REST; OR THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY	27
"CHURCHES" VERSUS "ROOMS"	41
REVIEWS:—LEIGH HUNT'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—The Auto- biography of Leigh Hunt; with Reminiscences of Friends and Contemporaries	46
QUEEN MARY.—The Clifton Tracts: Queen Mary and her People. No. 2. The Smithfield Fires	57
WRIGHT'S NARRATIVES OF SORCERY AND MAGIC.—Narratives of Sorcery and Magic, from the most Authentic Sources. By Thomas Wright, M.A., F.S.A., &c.	67
SHORT NOTICES.—Finlason's Catholic Hierarchy Vindicated by the Law of England.—Thomas à Kempis's Following of Christ.—A few Words about Music, by M. H.—Kate Devereux; a Story of Modern Life.—Third Annual Re- port of the Missionary College of Drumcondra.—The Bishop and the Cross, by Franciscus.—Mr. Collin de Plancy's Legends of the Seven Capital Sins.—The Order of Laying the First Stone of a New Church.—The London Catholic Church and Chapel Directory	79
CORRESPONDENCE.—Proposal for a "Priest's Portfolio."—St. Joseph and Mr. Pugin	82
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Religious Toleration in Catholic Countries.—Mission and Vicariate Apostolic of Madura, East Indies	83

To Correspondents.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

ERRATUM.

At p. 478 in our last Number, *for*

“ Non facies omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen, ut decet esse sororum,”

read

“ Facies non omnibus una est,
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.”

The Rambler.

PART XLIV.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:—No. I. Holy Communion.	87
A LECTURE AT ——— COLLEGE, IRELAND	110
STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION	118
THOUGHTS ON THE FESTIVAL OF THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY	145
REVIEW:—DOMESTIC GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.—Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England, from the Conquest to the End of the Thirteenth Century; with numerous Illustrations of existing Remains, from Original Drawings. By T. Hudson Turner	156
SHORT NOTICES.—The Roman Catacombs.—The Defender of the Faith and the Defence of the Seven Sacraments.—Father Newman's Lectures on the present Position of Catholics in England.—Stapf's Spirit and Scope of Education.—The Bible, its Use and Abuse, by Rev. P. Maclachlan.—The Clifton Tracts.—D. C. L.'s Letters on Church Matters.—Stothert's Lectures, The Glory of Mary in Conformity with the Will of God.—Oakeley's Few Words of Affection and Congratulation to his Fellow-Converts.—Mr. Maclachlan's Catholicism one in Principle and tolerant in Practice.—The Catholic Vindicator.—Something on Ruskinism	160
CORRESPONDENCE.—Representations of the Passion of our Blessed Lord in France.—The Angelus Bell.—On the Disposal of the Ablutions when Duplicating	162
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Lodging-Houses for the Catholic Poor.—Brief of his Holiness Pope Pius IX., placing St. Hilary of Poitiers in the rank of the Doctors of the Church.—Decree of the Holy Congregation of the Index, June 9, 1851.—Anglo-Italian Mission: New Church of St. Peter's in London	166

To Correspondents.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

R. received.

The Rambler.

PART XLV.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY	173
HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT:—No. II. Communion of Infants and of the Sick.	
• Other uses of the Most Holy Sacrament	180
PASSION, LOVE, AND REST; OR, THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY	198
ST. PUDENTIANA AND HER ROMAN CHURCH	208
POETRY.—God with us	215
REVIEWS:—ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE ON ERASTIANISM.	
—A Sketch of the History of Erastianism. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire	216
DR. ACHILLI AND THE INQUISITION.—Dealings with the Inquisition; or, Papal Rome, her Priests, and her Jesuits; with important Disclosures. By Giacinto Achilli, D.D.—Dell' Introdutione del Protestantismo in Italia; o sia la Chiesa Cattolica difesa colle Testimonianze de' Protestanti. Per Agostino Theiner, Sacerdote dell' Oratorio	235
SHORT NOTICES.—Dr. Rock's Hierurgia.—Dr. Crookall's Sacred Songs.—The Clifton Tracts.—Mr. Stewart's Catalogue of Works on Ecclesiastical and Monastic History and Antiquities.—M. de Rossi's Ancient Christian Inscriptions	253
CORRESPONDENCE.—On the Disposal of the Second Ablution in case of Duplication, Patron and Titular Saints, &c.	254
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act: its Authors	257

To Correspondents.

Micrologus.—Received, with thanks.

An Occasional Reader.—The subject is discussed in the *Tablet* of August 2d. The conduct of the King of Naples has nothing to do with the Catholic religion: the opinions put forth in the obnoxious Catechism on the divine right of kings are identical with those of the old Tory party in the Protestant Church of England.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

The Rambler.

PART XLVI.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION	259
PASSION, LOVE, AND REST; OR, THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY	285
REVIEW:—ANIMAL MAGNETISM.—Letters to a Candid Inquirer on Animal Magnetism. By William Gregory, M.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh	296
SHORT NOTICES.—Father Newman's Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England.—St. Mary and her Times, by the Authoress of "Geraldine."—A True Account of the Hungarian Revolution, by an American Democrat.—The Catholic Church and the Holy Bible: Protestantism and its Variations: choose which you will.—St. James's Dispensary, Spanish Place, London	326
CORRESPONDENCE.—Catholic Popular Education.—Devotions to the Blessed Sacrament	328
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—The Primate of all Ireland on a National Model School for Drogheda	340

To Correspondents.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. Burns and LAMBERT.

The Rambler.

PART XLVII.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE OLD PRIEST'S PARLOUR	345
STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION	357
REVIEWS:—NEWMAN'S LECTURES ON THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND.—Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England: addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory. By John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri	372
ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH RATIONALISTS.—Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme. Par M. l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens	396
THE PARSON FLY-FISHING.—The Erne, its Legends and its Fly-fishing. By the Rev. Henry Newland, Rector and Vicar of Westbourne	405
SHORT NOTICES.—Three Italian Masses, edited by Dr. Crookall.—The Oratory Lives of the Saints.—The Duties and Happiness of Domestic Service; or, a Sister of Mercy giving Instructions to the Inmates of the House of Mercy under her care.—Mr. Thring's Elements of Grammar Taught in English.—Lithograph Portraits of the Venerable Paul of the Cross and Monsignor Strambi.—The Dublin Review for October.—Mr. Johnson's Cottage Gardener's Dictionary.—The Clifton Tracts.—Mr. Gawthorn's Statement of the whole Case between himself, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Beresford Hope	410
CORRESPONDENCE.—Animal Magnetism	412
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Beatification of Father Claver: Letters Apostolic.—Allocution of the Pope on September 5.—Execution of a Catholic Priest in China.—Rules of the Catholic Defence Association, adopted at the Meeting in Dublin on the 17th October	413

To Correspondents.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

The Rambler.

PART XLVIII.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT	423
MIRACLES: FATHER NEWMAN AND THE BISHOP OF NORWICH .	443
REVIEWS:—ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH RATIONALISTS.—Des Rappports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme. Par M. l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens.	461
THE PROTESTANT CRITICISING.—1. Notes of a Residence in the Canary Islands, the South of Spain, and Algiers; illustrative of the State of Religion in those Countries. By the Rev. Thomas Debary, M.A.—2. What is the Working of the Church of Spain? What is implied in Submitting to Rome? What is it that presses hardest upon the Church of England? A Tract by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.—3. Heresy and Immorality considered in their respective bearing on the Notes of the Church: being a final Letter to the Editor of the <i>Guardian</i> . By William George Ward.—4. The <i>Spectator</i> Newspaper, No. 1213 . . .	471
QUAKERISM.—Quakerism; or the Story of my Life. By a Lady who for Forty Years was a Member of the Society of Friends.—A Portraiture of the Christian Profession and Practice of the Society of Friends. By Thomas Clarkson, M.A.	486
SHORT NOTICES.—Dr. Pagani's Life of Dr. Gentili.—The Catholic Florist.—Didron's Christian Iconography.—Cecile, or the Pervert, by the Author of "Rockingham."—The Excellence of Melody, and the Music of the Ancients.—Father Seraphin's Reflections on the Passion.—The Seven Lights of the Sanctuary, by Miss Agnes Stewart.—Mamma's Stories.—Fenelon's Sacred Reflections for Every Day of the Month.—Lacordaire's Conferences in	

CONTENTS.

	Page
the Cathedral of Notre Dame.—Wetzer and Welte's Kirchen-Lexicon.—The Clifton Tracts	498
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Decree of the Beatification, or De- claration of the Martyrdom, of the Venerable Servant of God, John de Britto, Priest professed of the Society of Jesus.—New Indulgences for the Recitation of the Chap- let.—Speech of the Rev. Robert Mullen on the Catholic University	501

To Correspondents.

C. F. D.—Received. The question has already been put to persons in the mesmeric sleep.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

JULY 1851.

PART XLIII.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR IRELAND.

IT is not often that a project is started in which those who have no peculiarly personal concern can feel so deep an interest as every enlightened Catholic must entertain in the projected Irish Catholic University. Side by side with the question of education, every other question is just now comparatively unimportant. On the education of the boys and youths of England and Ireland hangs the future of our destiny. Speaking humanly, the prosperity of the Catholic Church in England is bound up with the education of her young ecclesiastics, and the progress of her schools for the poor. But in Ireland the crisis is still more momentous. It is perhaps scarcely too much to say, that the very preservation of the faith in Ireland, *as a nation*, depends upon the energetic culture of the intellect of the middle and upper classes in *immediate* connexion with the truth of divine revelation.

This seems a strong statement; but it is impossible to note the signs of the times, and not admit that at least it *may be* the exact, unexaggerated truth. Ireland, be it remembered, possesses a class of the laity, not only far more numerous than the corresponding class among English Catholics, but far more exposed to the perils which Catholic education alone can counteract, and by natural character more open to the assaults of the tempter than we on this side of the Channel. With all the accessions to the Catholic middle and upper classes in England by the conversions of the last five or six years, the intelligent and educated portion of their laity bears an extremely small numerical ratio to their entire body. Stretching the line of what may fairly be considered as the educated classes to the widest limits, and bringing it down from the ducal peerage to the better class of tradesmen, after all, the intellectual strength of English Catholicism owes little to its

numbers. Exactly to compare these classes with those who answer to them in Ireland is of course impossible, even to those best informed. Still we shall perhaps be scarcely wrong if we estimate the number of young Catholic laity who require education of the highest kind as at least five times as large as the similar ranks in England. An accurate investigation might possibly shew a still wider disparity. The Irish middle and upper classes might amount to ten, fifteen, or twenty times as many as those in the English Catholic body. Whatever be the precise ratio, however, it is certain that the educational necessities of Catholic Ireland are enormously more urgent than those of Catholic England, so far as numbers alone are concerned.

Then contrast the characters and circumstances of the two countries, and see how fearfully imperative becomes the need of an Irish Catholic University. In the first place, it will not be denied by any Irishman, and it is admitted by many a Protestant Englishman, that the ancient Irish love for "learning," or "scholarship," or "knowledge," or by whatever name the desire be termed, has survived 300 years' influence of the most cunningly devised system for enthralling the soul which was ever hit upon by the enemies of almighty God and his Church. Every body grants that in days of old an absolute passion for learning existed in Ireland; and that it exists still, and is the most potent instrument conceivable for good or for evil, we think few well-informed persons will be inclined to doubt. A "school," in any shape, has a charm for the Irish heart, as well as the Irish head, which our adversaries know too well not to attempt to work upon, and in which they, *or we*, will assuredly find the elements of victory in the strife that ever rages between the world and the Church.

Yet how is this ardent tendency met by existing circumstances and institutions? First of all, the Catholic youth of Ireland are far more exposed to the perils resulting from intercourse with Protestant society than the Catholic youth of England. Here in this country our boys and young men associate for the most part with Catholics only. With many grievous exceptions in tradesmen's families, and of course not including the poor (of whom we are not now speaking), the young Catholic mind of England receives a cultivation, both in school and in domestic life, which, whatever its merits or shortcomings, is at least a Catholic culture. A Catholic gentleman, or respectable person in business, who has been brought up at a Protestant seminary is a rarity. Our colleges and private schools are abundantly sufficient for our needs; and the ban which in private society has drawn, in most cases, so rigid a

line between Catholics and Protestants, has had at least this one great blessing, that the atheism, the infidelity, the heresies, and the immoralities of Protestantism are kept comparatively out of sight from the young heart and head at the time when they are most ductile to every kind of example and impression.

In Ireland this almost total separation between the two creeds has been rendered impossible by the immense preponderance of the Catholic population. The Protestant government and the Protestant society of Ireland *could not* ignore their Catholic fellow-countrymen as Protestant England has ignored us. The statesmen who in London cared no more for a Catholic bishop than for a Methodist preacher, in Dublin pressed all their civilities upon the prelates of the popular religion. And as it was in Dublin Castle, so in its degree has it been throughout every class in the community. The Catholic religion is *something* in Ireland; its adherents are *somebody*; they are admissible to dinners and drawing-rooms and club-rooms, without undergoing the penalty of a compulsory silence on the nature of their faith, which is the usual condition of the *entrée* into English society.

Yet all this is perhaps little in comparison with the mischief wrought by the influence of Trinity College, Dublin, and by the fewness of thoroughly Catholic seminaries for the education of the laity. What institution can be conceived more deadly in its operations on the young intellect of Ireland than this "silent sister" of Oxford and Cambridge? Silent, indeed, she may have been; but the poniard is as fatal as the bullet, though it strikes noiselessly to the heart. Thanks be to God, the Protestantism of England has shut out Catholics from Oxford, and, with few exceptions indeed, from Cambridge also. No Catholic footstep treads on the desecrated pavements where Wykeham and Waynflete knelt; and some two or three unhappy youths are the only victims of parental ignorance who are sent to learn vice and mathematics on the banks of the Cam. It is in Ireland, in this respect as in so many others, that the *cunning* of the enemy of the Church has planned its masterpieces for the entrapping of souls into his meshes. Trinity College, Dublin, has done infinitely more to destroy the faith of Catholics than all the artillery that ever was fired from the batteries of the forty colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. Endowed with riches for its president and fellows far beyond any thing that exists in the English University; admitting Catholics to its classes and its degrees, but not to its emoluments; it has never ceased to combine the utmost practicable amount of seducing temptation with the utmost practicable amount of open injury.

The species of "liberality," and even respect, which in certain points of discipline, and in the intercourse of private life, is frequently conceded to the Catholic students, serves only to prepare the way for the operation of the poisonous atmosphere they are compelled to breathe. Were they daily insulted and scorned for their faith, there would result at least this counterbalancing advantage, that their suspicions would be aroused as to the true character of the teaching to which they listened; and as a mere point of honour they would retain their religion in spite of all the offers of reward for apostacy which the College revenues hold forth.

As it is, however, every thing is done which may blind the eyes of Catholic parents and students to the pernicious and anti-Catholic character of the instruction to which the young mind is subjected. As in the case of the condemned Queen's Colleges, so in the case of Trinity College, it is impossible that the Catholics who have permitted their children to enter into it can have given sufficient attention to the *necessarily* anti-Catholic character of all education in the hands of those who are not good Catholics themselves. If, then, these pages should fall into the hands of any Catholic father who has been inclined to accept the education of Trinity College as not *absolutely* evil, or to regard the Queen's Colleges with favour, as though not the best possible, yet better than no colleges at all, we most earnestly entreat him to take into consideration this one single truth, that in giving instruction on any one subject in which *man* is concerned, it is literally impossible to avoid all mention of religion, and consequently that it is equally impossible for a non-Catholic teacher to avoid teaching that which is anti-Christian and false. This momentous truth has, in fact, been studiously kept out of sight by the advocates of purely secular or of mixed education both in Ireland and in England. A hue and cry has been raised against theological "bigots," Catholic and Anglican, as being so simple as to object to a Protestant's teaching spelling, or an infidel's instructions in *Euclid*. Is not education, cries the popular voice, something more extensive than the teaching of religious dogmas? and why, in the name of common sense, should not Catholic and Protestant youths sit in the same lecture-room to study trigonometry and learn the import of Greek particles? Does not this bigotry, continues the enlightened liberal, betray the hostility of every priesthood to intellectual culture; and the tendency of every dogmatic creed to cramp the energies of the soul, and bind us down to the slavish ignorance of darker ages? Thus reason the friends of mixed education; and thus they taunt the Pope

and the Archbishop of Tuam, as men whose hostility to these new Colleges *must* spring solely from a dread of the real culture of the intellect, lest that culture should open the young mind to the follies of the faith of Rome.

Yet what is the fact as to *all* education? Is it not the most transparent of falsehoods to identify instruction in mathematics and languages with the education conferred even in the most superficial of schools? Is it not the most palpable of facts that a large proportion of the instruction every where given refers directly or indirectly to *man*, with all his passions, feelings, ideas, and actions, as they have been in every age, and still are, in ceaseless daily operation? Who ever dreams of teaching nothing but mathematics, physical science, and languages, to the young? Where is the school or college where nothing is uttered on such matters as history, or poetry, or fiction, or general literature, or the arts, or metaphysics, or moral philosophy, or political economy, or government? and what are all these things but the knowledge of what man is, and what he does, and what he thinks and feels? And is it not at the same time the most prominent fact in the records of mankind, that never can you study *man* without introducing religion in some shape or other? To pretend that by excluding professedly ecclesiastical history you exclude all questions between different creeds, is simply ridiculous. There is scarcely a book in existence, not treating on mere science or language, which is not more or less religious or anti-religious. *Either* truth or falsehood is implied, and openly taught. When God and his attributes and his revelation are excluded, that exclusion is an inculcation of practical atheism. You cannot separate man from his religion, for this simple cause, that he never has been separated from it, either in the way of obedience or resistance to the truth.

Take, for instance, the history of England, and see whether it be *possible* to give instruction in English history without either upholding or denying the truth of Catholicism. You might as well try to teach geometry and avoid all mention of circles and triangles, as teach the history of England without implying either that the Catholic faith is true or false. Open *any* historical treatise that comes first to hand, and see if a few pages do not betray the Catholicism, the Protestantism, or the atheism or scepticism of the writer. Let a man try his utmost to be fair and candid (as people call it) to all religions, the thing is totally out of his power. He *cannot* view all creeds and their adherents with an equally unbiased judgment; he cannot help perpetually applying that test to their actions which he himself conscientiously believes to be the correct test;

he cannot help supplying motives, and interpreting conduct, and filling up vacant spaces, in accordance with what his own faith, or his own unbelief, teaches him to be probable under any particular circumstances. There is no such thing as a non-religious history, or non-religious moral philosophy or metaphysics, or non-religious works in general literature. They all inculcate, silently or openly, *some* views respecting almighty God and the duties of man.

Here, then, is the true source of the deadly nature of such education as is to be gained in the Queen's Colleges and in Trinity College, Dublin. The evil lies not in the association of Protestants and Catholics in the lecture-room, or in the teaching of algebra and Latin by Protestants or atheists, or in the appointment of the professors by a Protestant or infidel government. Every one of these points might be given up, and yet the seminaries remain every whit as godless and anti-Catholic as they are now. These are not the grounds on which the Holy See has condemned the Queen's Colleges, though the English government takes good care to make it appear that these *are* the grounds on which the Pope has pronounced. The mischief lies in this, that the general teaching of the students is in the hands of men who are not Catholics, and who therefore *must*, by the very laws of human nature itself, instil falsehood into the minds of those under their instruction.

We appeal to any man who has had experience of the practical results of the teaching of any seminary in the whole world, which has professed to exclude religious dogma, in order to admit students of different creeds. There is University College, London; Trinity College, Dublin (where the system is *partly* professed); the University of Paris; and the whole host of German Universities. Will any man who *knows* these places pretend that the whole influence of the studies pursued and enforced has not been to destroy all faith in the Catholic religion, and even all belief in the existence of any dogmatic revelation whatsoever? Is it not undeniable that the faith of a young Catholic would be *more* subtly undermined at University College, London, than at Oxford or Cambridge?

And further still, it is of a piece with the ordinary shallowness of infidelity, to assume that differences in *doctrine* are the only things which distinguish the Catholic from the Protestant, and allege that if these can be avoided, they may all agree as to *morals*, properly so called. This assumption and allegation are totally untrue; Catholic morality is not identical, even in theory, with Protestant morality. Protestants, even the best of them, think many things allowable, if not absolutely

innocent, which we know to be immoral, and even to be mortal sins.

And will any man who knows the young mind pretend that it is safe to set before it the events of past history, the conduct of the personages whose acts it records, or to familiarise it with the general prose or verse writings of any age or country, without accompanying them with a thoroughly Christian criticism on their *moral* aspects? Who that knows the workings of the young intelligence will deny that from the earliest years children begin to form a judgment on the moral character of every person, and on the moral bearings of every event, of which they hear and read? Is it to be endured, then, that the works of writers who are generally Pagans, and rarely Catholics, shall be studied, at the most perilous period of life, under the guidance of men compared to many of whom the heathen Greeks were persons of piety and purity? Why, there is not one Protestant teacher out of twenty, and perhaps not one rationalistic teacher in existence, who would not laugh and jeer at the precautions for the preservation of the innocence of the young heart, which every Catholic thinks of importance indescribable. The non-Catholic world has, with few exceptions, absolutely no conception of the first rule in Catholic education, that the very knowledge of the existence and nature of vice should be kept from the young mind to the longest possible period. To those who know by experience what non-Catholic teaching is, it seems simply absurd to look to the average of the Protestant teachers as fit instructors for Catholic boys and youths, on moral grounds alone.

Moreover, it is not only in the school-room or lecture-room that the moral life of the young Catholic is undermined. We have no hesitation in asserting, that the immense majority of Protestant boys and young men are totally unfit companions for Catholic boys and youths in their hours of recreation. Undoubtedly there *are* exceptions, confined almost entirely to the case of those Protestants who have been brought up at home; but even in these instances a total ignorance of the sinfulness of some sins is nearly universal. If they have tolerably correct ideas on the law of purity, they have radically unchristian ideas on the law of charity. As to the overwhelming majority of young Protestants, you might as well place *Don Juan* on the school-room shelves as permit your sons to associate freely with *them*. If any of our readers who have been brought up Catholics doubt this, we entreat them to put the question to any intelligent convert, who can compare his knowledge of the morality of the two creeds, and he will confirm what we now say, when we assert that the *worst*-disciplined Catholic College

is far better in point of moral influence than the *best* of Protestant seminaries.

Our objections, therefore, to mixed education, whether at the Queen's Colleges, or Trinity College, Dublin, or elsewhere, we confess go beyond a dissatisfaction with the creed of tutors and professors. We believe all unrestrained intercourse between Catholics and non-Catholics in their boyhood and youth to be, with rare exceptions, fraught with peril to the souls of the former. For no educational advantages whatsoever would we tolerate it; and we are convinced that few good Catholic parents, if they knew the real facts of the case, would be of a different opinion.

Such, then, are the dangers to which the youth of Ireland, warm-hearted, intelligent, and sensitive to ridicule as they are, are now more than ever exposed. Is such a state of things to be borne with, when the opportunity has come for throwing around them the most powerful of safeguards, by offering them an education at once intellectually excellent and thoroughly Catholic? That many Catholics should have hitherto overlooked the evils of the Trinity-College education, and should have been reluctant to refuse the government offer of the new Queen's Colleges, when the Catholic Church herself had little enough to put in their place, was perhaps natural, though (in our judgment) most erroneous. But that any good Catholic who *knows the enormous influence of education*, should now hesitate to lend all possible support to the proposed Irish Catholic University, and that, with the special object of destroying the baneful power of the Colleges at Dublin, Cork, Galway, and Belfast, appears to our ideas scarcely credible.

The happy influence of a Catholic University, such as it is very possible to make this coming institution, would be, we are persuaded, incalculable; and its effects would not be confined to Ireland only. No doubt the bare existence of a Catholic University, irrespective of its particular merits, would be far enough from doing for the youth of Ireland all that they now so imperatively demand. Remembering the formidable obstacles and rivals it will have to encounter, the most sanguine must see that the *complete* success of the new institution will depend upon its thorough efficiency as a school for meeting the utmost desires which the ardour of the young mind can reasonably conceive. Mediocrity might not be, indeed, its absolute ruin; but it would infallibly be an unconquerable hinderance to its counteracting the pernicious effects of those rivals who are in previous possession of the field. Counting the power and influence of Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges at their lowest, it is mere folly to overlook

the seducing temptations they offer, and the resistance they will not fail to put forth to a Catholic University. Trinity College has all the advantages of *prestige*, of an established reputation, of a system fully at work, and of a respectable degree of talent and learning, backed by endowments of unexampled magnificence. The Queen's Colleges have all the array of "liberalism" ready put forth to tempt the unwary. The Government pets them, and rewards their supporters. Buildings and professors innumerable are prepared; and the endowments, unlike those in Dublin, are professedly open to Catholics as well as to Protestants; while there is little doubt that the Government would rejoice beyond measure to confer a bountiful reward on every young Catholic, who, if he did not actually apostatise to Protestantism, yet scorned the spirit of Catholic obedience, and boasted of his contempt for the mandates of the Archbishop of Tuam. Formidable, therefore, will be the foes to the new University; and we may rest assured that they will not yield it the victory without a vehement resistance.

All this, however, proves only one point, that the University must not underrate the magnitude of its task, or leave one stone unturned in its efforts to render its training of first-rate excellence. All it goes to shew is, the necessity of thoroughly considering the general system to be pursued, by a careful examination of the various existing Universities in different parts of England and the continent of Europe, and of confiding the carrying out of its founders' designs to men who are capable, both by their personal character and attainments, and by their enlarged and Catholic views of education, to confer that perfect *training* of the young mind of Ireland which the necessities of the day so loudly call for.

One other point, indeed, will demand the most serious consideration, viz. the question of endowments. Backed as are the Protestant and unbelieving Colleges with a vast storehouse of fellowships and scholarships, it appears to a looker-on to be of the first moment to found the new University on the old Catholic and mediæval model, so far as fellowships and scholarships are concerned. To mention a single instance. We all know how wonderfully Oxford, when it was a Catholic University, supplied the intellectual wants of its day, and how the system on which it was founded and carried out accomplished for England that very aim which the new University proposes to attain for Ireland. At one time we are told that there were as many as thirty thousand scholars *at once* in Oxford, boys and youths of every degree, some partly supported by endowments, some wholly so, others dependent on

their own means alone, some permanently resident, others occasionally so, but all drawn together by two potent attractions: the one, the unquestionable excellence of the education to be acquired; and the other, the aid given to poor scholars by the revenues of the various Colleges and Halls.

And why should not such days be restored again in Ireland? Long before Oxford's glories began to shine, Ireland was renowned through Europe as a country of rare learning and genius. The sun of Oxford's glory has set in the dark morass of Protestantism; the fame of Ireland has faded amidst the horrors of intestine commotion, foreign conquest, and English persecution. But the *life* still remains in Ireland; in Oxford it is extinct. Why, then, should not we see in our own time ardent scholars crowding from all parts of Ireland to the new seminary, confident that the intellectual training they will receive will be no whit inferior to the very best that the schools of the enemies of the Church can confer; and rejoicing in the knowledge that there at least that faith on which eternity depends will not be undermined, and that they will not be taught to win renown among their fellow-men at the expense of incurring the everlasting wrath of their Creator and their God?

The unbelieving world, we know, looks upon such an institution as an impossibility. Utterly ignorant of the Catholic Church, they fancy that the Catholic priesthood and prelates of Ireland are lovers of ignorance, and haters of science and learning, even beyond the ordinary class of priests and prelates. At this moment it is certain that a large majority of respectable Englishmen are convinced that the Archbishop of Armagh believes the sun to be somewhere about six yards in diameter: and this is but a specimen of Protestant notions respecting Catholic love for intellectual culture. With these ideas, therefore, they smile at the very supposition of an Irish Catholic University, which should beat the Queen's Colleges out of the field by the mere force of the excellence of the education it would bestow.

We, of course, knowing that the facts respecting the influence of Catholicism on the intelligence is the very reverse of the popular English theory, entertain very different anticipations regarding the new University. We know that the Catholic religion fears nothing from the exercise of the intellect, and that as a matter of fact the prelates and priesthood of Ireland would almost sing with joy at the sight of an Irish Catholic University, in which every faculty of the young intelligence was cultivated to a degree beyond that of any non-Catholic seminary in existence. We fear only one species of

knowledge and one species of intellectual development, *superficial* knowledge and a tendency to *rash* judgments. But we know too well the perfect harmony which exists between *all* the works of almighty God, both his works of nature and of grace; we know too well that the intellect is a portion of our nature given to us by Him for the very purpose of being employed; we know this too well to fear that any profound knowledge of earth will lead us astray respecting heaven, or that the more our poor faculties are strengthened by culture, the less worthy will be the offering of faith which they make to the God who called them into being.

In fact, it is an idle dream to imagine that Catholics, as such, are afraid of education. We venture to assert, that, speaking generally, the idea that intellectual cultivation tends to pervert the young to Protestantism or infidelity is utterly unknown to them. We are far enough, indeed, from pretending that English and Irish Catholics are always as much alive as they ought to be to the necessity of thoroughly educating all classes amongst us. But we do declare, that where this apathy exists, it does not arise from the fear of turning Catholics to Protestantism or unbelief; it is a mere feature of that dull, heavy, idle, uninformed Toryism, or Conservatism, or jealousy of the poor, or call it what you will, which is found in every country, age, and creed. It is a political and not a religious view. It is based on a love for high rents and aristocratic distinctions, and the good old days of Mr. Pitt, when the titled and the wealthy were the lords of this empire to an extent now almost forgotten. People who are ill-educated themselves are frequently excessively annoyed at finding the coming generation very much better taught than they were. A stupid man has often a strong belief in the virtues of stupidity; and ladies and gentlemen whose whole resources for recreation consist in reading the newspaper, playing at whist, going to the Opera, or talking gossip, cannot conceive what a working man has to do with politics, or Latin, or trigonometry. Of course, the Catholic body has its full share of such anti-educationists as these, like every other body in the whole world. But to say that the Catholic *priesthood* are more inclined to these views than the Catholic *laity*; or that the more devout a Catholic becomes, the more he is inclined to dislike education, is simply untrue.

With the deepest interest, then, and with the most earnest anticipations, we watch the progress of the Catholic University for Ireland; and with a proportionate delight we see the ever-increasing proofs that one difficulty at least—the money difficulty—is tolerably sure to be overcome. The game is clearly

in the hands of the chief promoters and managers of the undertaking. They *can* accomplish their noble work; and in spite of every obstacle and every enemy, we trust that they will lay the foundations of Ireland's future prosperity and faith so deep and wide, that no weapon formed against her shall prosper, and her new celebrity shall rival her fame in the brightest days of her past career.

STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

"THE Bridegroom," said Cardinal Wiseman, in a very remarkable sermon recently delivered in London, "the Bridegroom is ever speaking to His beloved Bride, the Church." This great Catholic truth was urged by the preacher with the special view of exposing the doctrinal error involved in all mere antiquarian revivalism of any of the externals of religion, based on any thing approaching to a censure of the living Church of the last three centuries. Had the course of his Eminence's argument led him in the direction, we can easily imagine the fertility of illustration with which he would have shewn how strikingly the Bridegroom's never-silent voice is responded to by another prince, who whispers unceasingly his suggestions to those who will listen to him, in the hope that he may stifle the divine words of love and guidance which are so hateful in his ears.

Variable, indeed, as are the outward circumstances of the Church, it is of the greatest moment that we never forget, that as her life and the source of her life never know change, so her struggle with the world and its master are ever in nature and spirit identical. The double-minded, the unstable, the timid, the time-serving, the compromising, the lovers of kings more than of popes, have been found among Catholics in every age; and it is only by tracing the history of the mischief they have wrought ever since the birth of Christianity, that we can altogether escape from needless despondency at the sight of our own present difficulties, within and without. The regret which has been felt by some amongst us at the interference (as they call it) of the Pope in the affairs of England and Ireland, is but the carrying out of views which worked in England for centuries before the Reformation, and which will work so long as man is man. For they are emi-

nently *natural* views; that is to say, they are *human*; they are according to the tendencies of human nature; they are the contradictions to the Bridegroom's voice which proceed from the mouth of his enemy and ours, and they have existed among Catholics in every country and in every age. Put broadly and boldly these ideas, and their real ultimate tendency and effect might be expressed in a pithy sentence from the orations of Protestant members of Parliament: "the *spiritual* should be *subservient* to the *temporal*!" Of course, Catholics can scarcely *profess* such a principle; but with the inconsistency of human nature, they may nevertheless practically act upon it. Many *Anglicans* would not *profess* the principle; yet, as Mr. Sidney Herbert said (in the course of the debate), in this country people have generally, with a Church in abject slavery to the State, lost all idea of a purely *spiritual* episcopate; and in the proportion in which the Church was controlled by the State, the same effect in some degree was produced when the country was Catholic. It is only to the unconscious infection of this Erastianism it can be ascribed that any English Catholics should have ever conceived any thing so monstrous as the idea of the creation of a Catholic hierarchy being conditional on the consent of the Crown! It must not be forgotten, however, that the same process of confusion and obscuration as to the purely spiritual character of the Church, and of its utter superiority to aught human or earthly, is certainly found of old working in the mind of Catholic England; and Catholics should understand the true character of the principles and ideas they thus either avowedly advocate or insensibly imbibe,—which they may best come to understand by observing their rise, progress, and results in our own ecclesiastical history. Those who advocate them try to avail themselves of the authority or example of Catholics at former times in the history of this country, and say, "See what was the control claimed and maintained by the Crown over the Church even in the ages of faith."

Passing for the present the difference between a *Catholic* and a *Protestant* sovereign, and the distinction between what is claimed or even *enforced* by the State, or is acquiesced in by the Church, and what is *acknowledged* by the Church as *rightfully* claimed by the State, it is of more importance to observe, that these principles and ideas arose in Catholic England contemporaneously with corruptions and abuses; and ultimately resulted in "reformation," or rather in separation. This is what we propose to prove; that the views and ideas of those who now stickle for some control of the temporal over the spiritual, or who scruple at the perfect

freedom and superiority of the spiritual over the temporal, are really those which were consummated and embodied in the Reformation; but were in constant, though often insensible antagonism to the Church for centuries *before* the Reformation; and that their triumph was *in* the Reformation. We shall shew that all along there was (at least since the Conquest) a contest between the Church and the Crown; the struggle being on the part of the Crown to secure a control over the Church; and the *pretence* being that the Crown had *endowed* the Church; the *r  al reason* being, that it was found and felt to be *inconvenient* to the State, that the spiritual should be independent of the temporal, simply because the spiritual and the temporal are at variance by the law of their nature, the State representing the one, as the Church does the other. History too, it will be seen, shews that they are antagonistic elements; and that the State—that is to say, the “world”—being “of the earth, earthy,”—embodying what is secular and selfish, must ever, by an eternal law, be “at enmity” with the Church; and seek to subject to itself the divine power, whose very presence is a restraint and a reproach to its own coarser character. Nor let any deem this language too strong; for it is (in substance) the language, not of obsolete canonists, but of that sage of our common law, whom even Coke revered and venerated,—it is the language of Bracton, who says: “To the Church belongs the spiritual, to the State the temporal; just as it is written, the *heaven* is the Lord’s, the *earth* hath He given to the sons of men.”

It is indeed chiefly from our *legal* history that we propose to shew the constant endeavours of the State, *i. e.* the secular power, to encroach upon the Church, that is, the spiritual; commencing with protection; proceeding to a claim of *control*; then passing on to domination; and consummating its progress by *destruction*; the principle of the encroachments being identical with, and inevitably tending to, schism and separation, *i. e.* the human opposing itself to the divine. In a pamphlet recently published on the Hierarchy,* it has been proved that these endeavours *are* encroachments, and were by the law of this country *considered* so; and were therefore, before the Reformation, not established, nor successful; but that *then* they became established by *law*; embodied with royal, as opposed to the Papal supremacy; and that so soon as this was settled as to the E-stablished Church, she ceased to be Catholic, and became Protestant. It will here be shewn, however,—and it is most important that it should be observed,—that this principle of evil was working in the

* “The Catholic Hierarchy vindicated by the Law.” Dolman.

country for ages previously; (from the period when the Crown first acquired any sort of control over the Church;) and that it was ever and anon displaying itself in some aggression on the Church; and that the pretext put forward in its favour was, that the spiritual had temporal incidents which the State must control; and to control which, it must in some degree indirectly control the spiritual, so far at least as the State deems necessary for the object. And it will be seen that before the Reformation there was a constant and unsuccessful struggle on the part of the State to reconcile this course with its recognition of the superiority of the Church in spirituals; and that at the Reformation the more logical, and more consistent and successful policy, was adopted of proclaiming the temporal superior to the spiritual.

It will be shewn that this was, in fact, only a logical development of the principle previously contended for by the State, which really implied that the thing to be considered and provided for as primary and paramount was, that the Crown should control the temporal; and that it was a thing of less moment that the Church should control the *spiritual*. For from that principle it followed, that if in any case the Crown could not completely control the temporal without interfering with the spiritual, the spiritual must yield; and that the State must be the supreme judge of this supposed necessity. We shall shew that, though before the Reformation the principle was always admitted that the Church should control spirituals (just as it may now be admitted by many Anglicans, and by all Catholics, however inclined to Erastianism), yet it was not always admitted that this was to be deemed the primary and paramount consideration, and that the Church was to judge what was of spiritual cognizance. So that if the temporal claim clashed with it, the temporal claim must *yield*; and at all hazards the authority of the Church be preserved pure, entire, and intact over the spiritual. And this was not admitted exactly from the same feelings and ideas on which it was afterwards denied; and which—that is to say, the underrating and disregarding the paramount importance of the spiritual authority of the Church, and the supremacy of the Holy See,—resulted, with all the rapidity and certainty of a clear logical sequence in the Reformation.

Now in the Anglo-Saxon age, when the Catholic Church first won the nation to the faith, the Church and her episcopate were considered at all events for ages as purely spiritual. Thus was the episcopate regarded, whether in respect to the *source* or the *exercise* of its authority, *i. e.* as to the power of appointment to the episcopate, or as to the performance of

its sacred and supernatural functions; in the conferring of pastoral jurisdiction; the consecrating to episcopal dignity, or the excommunicating from the body of the faithful. All this was considered by the State as simply *spiritual*, and of exclusively spiritual cognizance that is, in the hands of the Church, and of the Holy See as her head. It could scarcely be otherwise when the English Church and episcopate had been known in its origin to be of spiritual character and founded on Papal authority.

Pope Gregory wrote thus to St. Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, exactly in the same way in which Pope Pius wrote to the first Archbishop of Westminster:

"In regard to the new Church of the English, &c., we grant you the use of the pall, and that you in several places ordain twelve bishops, who shall be subject to your jurisdiction, &c. And we will have you send to the city of York such a bishop as you shall think fit to ordain; yet so as that, if that city shall receive the word of God, that bishop also shall ordain twelve bishops, and enjoy the honour of a metropolitan."

And Pope Honorius wrote thus to the sovereign in regard to the first Archbishop of York:

"We have sent two palls to the two metropolitans, to the intent that when either of them shall be called out of this world, the other may, *by this authority of ours*, substitute another bishop in his place, which privilege *we* are induced to grant," &c.

And in similar terms to the Archbishop himself:

"Pursuant to your *request* and that of the *king* (the requests of both being put on the same footing both as equally inferiors in spirituals), *we do in the name of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, grant you authority*, that when either of you die, the other shall ordain a bishop in the room of him who is deceased; to which effect we have sent a pall to each of you, that *by the authority of this precept* you may," &c.

So Pope Boniface wrote to the successor of St. Augustine:

"We send you the pall, *granting you to ordain bishops when there shall be occasion.*"

And thus he established indeed the see of Canterbury as metropolitan:

"We command that the metropolitical see be for ever in the city of Canterbury, and that all provinces of England be subject to that Church."*

* It was removed by Pope Adrian to Lichfield, and by Pope Leo restored to Canterbury. And the council of Clovestrie speaks thus of the latter act: "The Pope, by his authority, ordained that the dignity of the see of Canterbury should be restored in its integrity."

And this is the language held equally to *Catholic* kings; even after some such partial endowments of particular churches as no doubt followed forthwith upon their conversion; and of which the following is the simple statement of history:

“Augustine Archbishop of Britain ordained two bishops, one at the city of London, where the king built a church, the other at Rochester, where also the king built a church, bestowing many gifts on the bishops of both those churches, as well as on that of Canterbury, *adding lands and possessions.*”

Here is the whole history of endowment, the rise and progress of Church establishment. The episcopate is first created by the Holy See; then the bishops, &c., appointed under the same authority; then the king endows the sees. And yet it is long ere we find the Crown claiming, and allowed by the Church, even mere right of *patronage*, *i. e.* (by reason of such endowments) the right of presentment.

It was recognised by the Anglo-Saxon law, that the Pope (or, under him, the Archbishop), and *not the king*, had power to convoke synods, and that these synods had (subject to the Pope's approval) authority to make binding regulations, recognised by the law, as to all things spiritual; the *Church herself deciding what was spiritual*, and deeming it to include the *establishment of new sees*. Thus we find in Bede that Theodore (the first primate of all England,) convenes a synod (at Hatfield), in the ‘acts’ of which he merely recites that it was in a certain year of the king's reign, and commences thus: “Theodore, by the grace of God Archbishop of the island of Britain and the city of Canterbury, *president.*”^{*} And so we read that in another synod it was decreed that the province of the South Saxons, which till then belonged to the diocese of the city of Winchester, should have an episcopal see and bishop of its own.[†] This is the more remarkable, when it is remembered that by this time the bishoprics were always endowed, notwithstanding which they were never created, nor was the creation controlled by the Crown; and after they had been created and endowed, the distinction between the spiritual and temporal was broadly drawn, and the Crown never interfered except as to the latter; and then always with the consent and concurrence of the Church. There are to be found in ancient Saxon charters very remarkable instances illustrative of this. One which we will cite from the Saxon Chronicle (A.D. 657), with regard to the monastery of Medeshemsted. We read that “when the monastery had been hallowed in the names of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew, then the king stood up and said with a clear voice, ‘Thanked be the high almighty

^{*} C. xvii.

[†] C. xviii.

God for the worthy deed which here is done, and I will this day do honour to Christ and St. Peter. I do this day give to St. Peter, and the abbot and monks of this monastery, *these lands* freely, so that none but the abbot and monks shall have any claim on them. The gift is little, but it is my will that they shall hold it so royally and so freely, that *neither gold nor tribute shall be taken from it, except for the monks alone : and thus free* I will make the minster, that it be subject to Rome alone."

The king also granted that the abbot might build a minster: and the grant was written and subscribed with the sign of the cross by the king and bishops. It will be seen that in this charter (which was confirmed by the Pope), the king only professes to deal with the temporal, or to speak more strongly (and in these days more clearly), the *territorial*. And one reason why we particularly refer to and ask attention to this case is, to shew how, after the lapse of three centuries, when we find in the Saxon Chronicle (A.D. 963) the same grant confirmed, we shall see that the same principle is developed, although with certain ambiguities of expression, caused by, or calculated to create, ideas clear and less distinctly defined as to the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal: we read that the minster had been "destroyed by heathen men," but that hidden in the old walls, the writing (the charter) had been found, shewing "how the king had built the minster, and caused it to be freed against king and bishops,* and against all *secular services* : and how the Pope had *confirmed* the same." Then we read that the king caused the minster to be rebuilt, and gave the abbot a new charter, thus (A.D. 963):

"I, King Edgar, grant before God and Archbishop Dunstan," "freedom to St. Peter's *minster*," Medeshemsted (Peterborough), "from king and from bishop and all the *villages* which lie (adjacent) thereto: that no bishop have any command (*i. e.* over the *minster* or lands,) without the abbot; and I give the town called Oundle, with all that thereto lieth, and market and toll, so freely that neither king nor bishop have there any command," &c.

The king's part in the grant, it will be seen, is confined clearly to lands and temporalities; and even as to these the Archbishop joins his consent. Such charters as these are with unaccountable obtuseness often alluded to by Anglicans as proving that the Crown had a control over the authority of the episcopate; whereas they shew just the reverse; that so much more important was it deemed that the Church should be

* These words are not those in the old grant, but of equivocal import, though explained by the context.

supreme in spirituals, than that the Crown should be in temporals, that even in a charter, the scope and purview of which was "buildings," and "lands," and "tolls," and other things entirely temporal; yet, because they *pertained* to the Church, the Primate and the Bishop were joined and made parties. At the same time it is impossible not to see that by this time the spiritual was becoming *mixed up* with the temporal in men's minds, so that a phraseology is used (as already observed) of an ambiguous character, and implying that people had begun to think more of the temporalities attached to a bishopric than the bishopric itself, or the episcopate properly so called; for it was not the latter alone, but to the episcopate and its endowments that the term "bishopric" was applied; and afterwards it appears to be applied *only* to the *endowments*.

There is another charter of the same age affording a very useful illustration of these observations, a charter in which there is the same occasional ambiguity of expression; but on the whole, a recognition of the spiritual supremacy of the Church and the Holy Sec. Edgar grants to the "monastery of the holy Mother of God at Glastonbury, by the consent of the *bishops* and abbots, &c., certain privileges. The first is, that no person except a monk of the place shall be abbot, nor any other except such as the common consent of the house shall have chosen according to their rule. He had appointed also that the election of abbot shall be for ever in the monks, reserving only to himself and his heirs the power of *giving the pastoral staff to the elected brother*. He hath granted moreover, that as he himself decides in his own dominions, so the abbot and convent shall decide the causes of their entire island,* *in all matters ecclesiastical or secular*."

If this were the correct text of the charter, its terms would draw as great a deflection from the primitive purity of idea on the subject in the age in which the charter is granted, as in that in which it is recorded. But it is plain that more authentic mss. omit the above, and assert the following as the terms of the charter itself; whereas the above is only its supposed effect inaccurately stated. It recites that, "though the decrees of Pontiffs are fixed like the foundations of the mountains, yet, nevertheless, *through the storms and tempests of secular matters*, and the corruptions of reprobate men, the institutions of the Church of God are often convulsed and broken."

And then it proceeds thus:

"Dunstan, Archbishop, &c. *assenting*, I, Edgar, by the

* Glastonbury is situated on land which was once an island formed by stagnation of inland waters.

grace of God, king of the English, do establish that the monastery of the most blessed Mother of God, the eternal Virgin Mary, of Glastonbury, shall remain free and exonerated from all payments to the exchequer; and have toll, &c. as freely as I have in my kingdom; and the same liberty and power as I have in my own courts. Moreover, I *confirm* what has hitherto been *observed* by my predecessors, that the Bishop of Wells shall have no power over this monastery or its parish churches, nor cite their priests to synods or chapters, &c.; and by my authority, *saving the right of the holy Roman Church*, I inhibit all persons of whatever dignity from entering the bounds of Glastonbury for the purpose of holding courts, &c., and the abbot shall alone have power in *all causes*."

It is clear from the tenor of both versions of the charter that the king granted what was temporal, *i.e.* jurisdiction, in *all causes*—and it is plain, at all events, from the more authentic version, that as to what was spiritual, he only *upheld*, by his royal and temporal authority, the privileges of the abbey; so that in substance the case is quite in conformity with the principles previously spoken of. And let it be observed, that the charter was confirmed by the Pope, and that the Archbishop was party to it: and it is a clear rule of the law of England (of which there are daily illustrations), that, when two or more parties join in a grant, it takes effect according to the legal capacity of each; and each grants what he has *power* to grant, and no more; and that when one 'grants' and another 'confirms,' if he who grants has no power to grant, and he who confirms *has*, it is in law the grant of the *latter*. In the reign of Canute we find another charter to the same monastery, in which the king says (William of Malmesbury, A.D. 1032):

"I grant to the Church of the holy Mother of God at Glastonbury its rights and customs; and all *forfeitures* throughout its possessions, and that *its lands* shall be free from all claim and vexation as mine own are. Moreover, I inhibit any one from entering the island; but *all causes, ecclesiastical and secular*, shall await the sole judgment of the abbot."

The substance of this, as of the other royal charters, is clearly temporal in its scope and character. In that early age it is unreasonable to expect exact accuracy of expression, especially as there was generally the utmost *accordance* between the Crown and the Church, and the utmost mutual confidence and amity. The extent to which this accordance and amity between the Church and the State existed, and the extent to which the State recognised not only the spiritual

supremacy of the Church, but the superior and paramount importance of that supremacy, as compared with the temporal sovereignty of the Crown, must now be shewn by a review of the laws of our Anglo-Saxon kings.

The only records we possess of the laws of the Anglo-Saxons are the "Digests" of Christian kings; and of these the earliest is that of King Ina, who reigned in the seventh century. The very first sentence of this digest* expresses the whole spirit of the Anglo-Saxon law on the subject.

"First, we command that *God's servants rightly hold their lawful rule.*"

That is, the *secular* power supports the *spiritual*, by recognising its rule, and so far as respected any thing capable of enforcement by the secular power, by enforcing it; and of this one instance is—

"Let church-scots be rendered at Martinmas; and if any one do not perform that, let him forfeit 80 shillings, and render the church-scot fourfold."

The severity of the penalty sufficiently shews the sense entertained of the sacredness of whatever belonged to the Church. So, in another digest,† the "great men" decree,

"To the Church freedom from imposts."

None of these laws affect to *confer* on the Church any spiritual power, but simply to support her laws by the secular power; in other words, to make the secular laws run parallel with the spiritual, of which the episcopal synods were recognised as the sole arbiters. Thus, again, in the digest of King Alfred, it is recited,

"That there were many synods assembled among the English (after they had received the faith of Christ,) of holy bishops, and also of other exalted 'witan.' They then ordained a penalty for many human misdeeds."

So, in the laws of King Edmund,

"Edmund, king, makes known to all in his dominion, that he has deliberated with the council of the 'witan,' first, how he might most *promote* Christianity."

In every one of these digests the State only assumes to come *in aid* of the Church with *temporal* power. Thus, again, in the laws of King Edgar it is ordained,

"First, that God's churches be entitled to every right, and that every tithe be rendered to the old minster to which it belongs."

While, by the same monarch, it is distinctly declared, that the law spiritual was solely in the hands of the Church.

* Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, vol. i. p. 103.

† Laws of King Wahfred; Ancient Laws and Institutes, vol. i.

"We ought never to disobey our bishops in any of those things which they teach us on the part of God; so that through the obedience with which we obey them *on account of God*, we may merit that eternal life to which they fit us by doctrine and example of good works."

And to mark more strongly the distinction between the spiritual and temporal, the very next words are,

"I will that *secular* rights stand among every people as good as they can be best devised, to the pleasure of God and to my perfect royalty."

And then the purview of this 'royalty' (or prerogative) is set forth; and even enactments pertaining wholly to *property* and things temporal. So in the laws of King Canute:

"*Bishops are teachers of God's laws.*"

So in the laws of King Ethelred:

"Let no man reduce a Church to servitude, nor unlawfully make church-mongering, nor *turn out a church-minister without the bishop's counsel.*" "And if for a '*got-bōt*' (a spiritual fault) a pecuniary penalty shall arise, which a wise secular '*witan*' may have established, as a penalty that belongs rightly, *by the direction of the bishops*, to the buying of prayers, to the behoof of the poor, and the reparation of churches, and as a *secular correction for divine purposes.*" "And let all God's dues be furthered diligently as is needful; and if any one refuse, let him be compelled to what is right by *secular correction*: let that be in common to Christ and to the king. For a Christian king is accounted Christ's vicerent* among Christian people, *to avenge offence to Christ.* And wise were those secular '*witan*,' who to the divine laws of right added secular laws for the people's government, and directed the '*bōt*' to Christ and to the king that many should be compelled to right." "If a mass-priest flagrantly commit crime, let him forfeit his order and country, and be an exile *as far as the Pope may prescribe* to him; if he be guilty of theft, &c., let him be cast out from the community of ecclesiastics, *unless he make 'bōt' to God as the bishop may direct him.*" "The king commands his '*reeves*' that they *protect the abbots on all secular occasions*:" "and if any one wrong an ecclesiastic, the king shall be to him a *protector.*"

It is impossible not to perceive that the Crown only claimed to be a protector of the Church.

In the celebrated laws of Edward the Confessor, however (or rather his digest of the common law, as our law writers rightly suppose), is contained the most complete exposition of the relation of the Church to the State; or, as the lawyers of

* See as to this the laws of the Confessor.

that day would have expressed it, of the State to the Church. The digest begins thus:

“To holy Church, by which the king and kingdom are sustained, peace and liberty are secured. The clergy, and all their possessions, shall be under the peace of God and of holy Church.”

The latter sentence explains the former, and it is plain that the Crown assumes only to *protect* the Church in her *possessions*, in her *liberty*, and in her *peace*. And how this was understood will be explained by some instances from the next section:

“If any one excommunicated shall go the bishop for amendment, he shall have, in coming and returning, the peace of God and his holy Church. And if any will not amend for the sentence of the bishop, let him shew it to the king, and he shall constrain the transgressor that he amend.”

That is, the Crown only enforced the sentence of the bishop; and the Crown clearly had no idea of any right to interfere in the sentence itself. So again:

“If any shall break the peace of holy Church, then it is the jurisdiction of the bishop. And if he shall proudly condemn the sentence, he shall be delivered to the justice of the king, until, *first to God*, and then to the king, he shall make satisfaction.”

Here it is obvious the Crown assumed only the secondary position of supporting the sentence of the Church by secular power; and the right of the Crown was evidently deemed quite *subordinate* to that of the Church. Again:

“The king, who is constituted vicar of the Great King for *this*, that he may the kingdom and the people, *and above all* holy Church, rule and defend from injury, will destroy and root up all wrong-doers.”

The expression used in the former part of the sentence, *Vicarius Summi Regis*, is by Anglicans, according to their ordinary usage, severed from its context, and put forward as shewing that the king as well as the Pope was Vicar of Christ. They had not, however, dreamt of *that* in those Saxon ages; and it was reserved for the era of the Tudors and Stuarts to develope that doctrine. The meaning of the expression, as explained by the context, is precisely in accordance with a similar passage in the laws of King Ethelred:

“A Christian king is anointed Christ’s vicegerent, among a Christian people, and *to avenge offences against Christ*.”

And in the same digest this is said to be the duty of *all* Christian men, to the utmost of their power; so that there was nothing peculiar in the position or power of the king

except as to *degree*; and he possessed no more in point of *character* than any other layman. And it is to be observed of all these laws of the Confessor, that they contain no enactments at all *pertaining* to, but only as *protective* of, the spiritual, which was left under the sole cognizance of the Bishops, regulated by the canon law, as settled in their synods; that law and those synods being constantly referred to, and recognised by, the secular law, which also recognised, it will have been seen, the absolute power of the episcopate over the spiritual sentence of excommunication; and only offered it the aid and sanction of the secular power to awe those who cared not for the spiritual. In entire accordance with all this was the *Mirror of Justice*, probably the oldest law-book extant, and said to have been written before the Conquest.

“The *canon* law consisteth in the amendment of spiritual offences, of admonition, censure, excommunication. The *secular* law consisteth in the punishment of temporal offences by secular penalties. Of the *spiritual law* the *prelates* judged, and lay princes of the other law, which law is called the common law; and kings have no jurisdiction but of mortal offences and rights of the Crown, and the wrongs of their ministers, and wrongs against common law and common ordinances.”

And, the “rights of the Crown” are stated exactly in accordance with the terms of the old charters above alluded to, as comprising tolls and other temporalities. It is most important to remark that there is not, throughout the work, any allusion to any rights of the Crown even over the temporalities of the Church; or rather, by reason of temporalities, any right of *patronage* or presentment to vacant benefices or bishoprics; and this is a strong proof that, whatever claim the Crown, before or after the Conquest, made on that score was originally an encroachment, however much it may have been afterwards acquiesced in by the Church, or so incorporated with the law. It is true that contemporary history shews that the Church, in courtesy to the Crown, which had endowed her, and in consequence of that confidence and amity which existed between them in those ages of faith, constantly consulted the Crown, and acted, of course, *with* its consent; although it is clear, from what has been shewn as to the preceding history and primary foundation of the Church, that she acted not by *reason* or by *right* of that consent. It was natural and inevitable that, with sovereigns so many of whom were *saints*, the Church should seem to act in *concert*; and that with her St. Oswalds and St. Edmunds and St. Edwards, she should have no scruple or jealousy in assembling her synods in their presence, or in consulting their recommendations as to the episcopate.

But that these concessions of confidence and courtesy, afterwards so abused, and converted into encroachments by sovereigns the reverse of saints, were *only* such concessions, and were not claims, rightful or legal, is clear from this, that the law, as we have seen, utterly "ignored" them all, and knew of no right or claim on the part of the Crown even to urge "lay-patronage or presentment."

Such was the *law of the land* at the close of the long Anglo-Saxon period of our history; and now our readers will be able to appreciate the learning of another of our church-and-state lawyers, and of his high qualifications to legislate upon the subject: we mean, Mr. Walpole, who declared in the great debate, in which, by a display of ignorance rather superior to that of his ignorant hearers, he easily acquired an enormous reputation, that he "had read many books, and taken pains to inform himself—and that he had discovered" that the See of Rome never had any control in this country until the Conquest. The *truth* is (as our readers will hereafter find), that from the Conquest till the Reformation there was one constant system of encroachment and aggression on the part of the Crown against the Church, originally upon her temporalities, eventually—as already intimated—when it was found these could not be got at without touching the spiritualities, upon the spiritualities under *pretence* of controlling the temporalities; and ultimately, at the Reformation, without any concealment or pretence at all,—upon the *spiritualities*.

The process of corruption which preceded this system of encroachment had commenced indeed in the Saxon age. In charters, to which St. Dunstan was a party, we have seen there was a carelessness of expression; but in the next century we find people's perceptions of the *spiritual* so clouded, and the idea of the episcopate so confounded with its endowment, that even the monkish chroniclers speak in the same breath of the 'bishopric' and its 'possessions,' and soon come to use the term 'bishopric' wholly for its possessions; and this prepares us to find what the same chroniclers now inform us, that the 'bishoprics' were given and taken by the king, and were notoriously bought and sold.*

Hence we are not surprised to find that in the reign of the Confessor a practice had arisen of the king's conferring the

* Stigand the priest was blessed Bishop of the East Angles; and soon after he was deposed from his bishopric, and all that he possessed was seized into the king's hands. (Sax. Chr. A.D. 1043.) "Archbishop Eadswine gave up the archbishopric, and blessed thereto Siward as bishop, by the king's leave and counsel: it was known to few else before it was done, because the Archbishop thought that some other man would obtain it or buy it, whom he could less trust in, if more men should know of it." (Sax. Chr. A.D. 1044.)

ring and crosier upon elected bishops,—a practice clearly in its origin having reference to temporalities; since there was always an *election* and a royal *missive* accompanying the gift directing the civil officer or guardian of the temporalities of the see to deliver them to the bishop.* Still that the signs of episcopal jurisdiction should have been delivered as the symbols of temporal property—although even by a royal saint—was a practice of a vicious character, and an unconscious means of corruption, of which we soon reaped the fruit. We read :

“ In the reign of the Confessor, Robert Archbishop of Canterbury proceeding to Rome, and appealing to the Apostolic See in his cause, as he was returning died. While he was yet living, Stigand, who was Bishop of Winchester, invaded the archbishopric of Canterbury, who, through desire of a higher dignity deserting the bishopric of the South Saxons, had occupied Winchester, which he held with the archbishopric. For this reason he was never honoured with the pall; and in the reign of William was degraded by the Roman Cardinals.”

So also we find in the reign of the Confessor, bishoprics given with very suspicious frequency to the king's chaplains, or other courtiers and clerks :

“ Alfric Bishop of Helmham died, and was succeeded by Stigand, the *king's chaplain*” (A.D. 1044). “ Leofic, the *king's chancellor*, obtained the prelacy of Crediton” (A.D. 1046). “ Ulf, the *king's chaplain*, was promoted to Dorchester” (A.D. 1050). “ Ethelstan Bishop of Hereford died, and was succeeded by Laveger, *Duke Harold's chaplain*” (A.D. 1056).†

So also we read of *pluralities*. Thus it is stated :

“ Living, who held the bishoprics of Worcester, Crediton, and Cornwall, died this year” (A.D. 1046). “ Elfwin Bishop of Worcester died, and Stigand Bishop of Helmham, being placed in his room, kept both sees” (A.D. 1047).

It is clear that the Church had become corrupted by a love of temporal possessions, and that in consequence of this the Crown had acquired an influence it had not formerly over the episcopate.

It matters not, of course, much to our argument, whether this system was the cause or the origin of corruption in the Church; probably, with the usual inevitable reaction of evil, it was (in the long-run, at all events,) both the one and the other; but as we have already indicated, our own idea is, that

* See Lardner's Hist. Ang.-Sax. Church.

† Roger de Wendover.

it arose in the confidence the Church reposed in saintly sovereigns; and was ultimately converted into a process of corruption and a course of encroachment by prelates and princes equally *unsaintly*. The *foundation* was unconsciously laid, as we have shewn, in the Saxon age, of which we have thus closed a cursory review. The fatal result which followed, and the resistance at last aroused on the part of the Church, and her long struggle with the incessant aggressions of the State, we reserve for a following article; to be followed by a third on the history of the Reformation, to which all these things were precursors.

So far as we have at present gone, this moral we may safely draw, that so perilous is it for the Church to permit the State to interfere with her, that even in a dynasty of saints it sowed the fatal seeds of corruption, and encroachments pregnant with results pernicious and disastrous.

Passion, Love, and Rest;

OR,

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY.

(Continued from vol. vii. p. 509.)

CHAPTER X. — *Love.*

I FIND it difficult, if not impossible, to describe my sensations for some time after I became a Catholic. Joy, repose, wonder, agitation, gratitude, fear, a mingled good humour and impatience with every thing around me, all combined to produce a state of mind as delightful as it was without parallel in my previous history. I do not exaggerate, when I say that my past life seemed to drop off from me like a garment. The old systems of belief and unbelief in which I had trusted, all at once appeared the creations of an unhealthy dream. I could compare my sensations to nothing else than those of a blind man restored to sight. In a moment I seemed to have come at last into a land of realities. How I ever remained so long ignorant of the claims of the Catholic Church was incomprehensible to me. How I could ever have believed in old-fashioned Church of Englandism or Evangelicalism, I could not conceive. The same wonder filled me when I thought of the rest of the well-conducted Protestant world. "What

conceivable gratification or satisfaction can they find in their wretched figments," I said to myself, "that they should persist in closing their eyes to the light of Catholic truth? Are they mad, or blind, or wilfully wicked, that they do not see these things, which appear to me almost as self-evident truths?"

I talked of all this now and then to Cumberland, who smiled, somewhat to my disgust, at my amazement at Protestant incredulity. "My dear Morley," he said, "remember what you were yourself only a few months, or even weeks ago. I don't wonder at your feelings of joy and exultation, and most heartily I sympathise with you; but your eyes are dazzled with the floods of light that have poured in upon them. By and by you will estimate other people's difficulties, as well as the real sources of their unbelief, more calmly and correctly."

"But surely you don't think I do wrong in giving way to my present joyfulness and sense of triumph over the world and all the snares the devil has hitherto put in my way."

"Far from it, far from it, indeed," he replied; "this bounding exuberance of happiness is a gift from God, often given to those who enter the Church, as a refreshment before the commencement of those new kinds of struggles which they must endure so long as life lasts."

I was surprised at the tone of his reply, and rejoined,

"But how easy must victory be in any struggle to a Catholic! When I compare the indescribable repose I now enjoy, and the wonderful aids I find all around me, with the miserable weapons I used to be compelled to fight with, I can hardly conceive how conquest over *any* adversaries can be difficult. Wonderful, wonderful is the change indeed! Just think of the invincible strength to be derived from a visit to the Blessed Sacrament, for instance. I really cannot imagine how a Catholic, with such ineffable sources of peace at his hand, can ever give his thoughts to earthly things, much less fall into mortal sin. As to actual apostacy, it seems to me simply an impossibility."

"Depend upon it, my dear Morley," rejoined Cumberland, laying his hand gently on my shoulder, as we stood talking in front of the fire in his room, "the rest and repose you now enjoy are almost as a storm in comparison with that which is granted to those who have passed through those trials which you have now not even begun; provided, of course, they neither faint nor slacken in the conflict. You are now only at the beginning of your life as a Catholic; you know already something, perhaps much, of almighty God and his gifts; but you do not, you cannot know much of yourself, or of the

peculiarities of the Christian life. Yet the warfare *must* come; and the day may not be very far distant when you will be longing for the hour when the struggle of life is ended. Pardon me for saying all this so decidedly to you, and so early after your entrance into that which is, after all, a land flowing with milk and honey. I would not have said it, but that I am sure you will not be discouraged when trouble comes."

"I would not be confident," I answered; "but indeed I feel as if I could face any amount of persecution and suffering for the sake of such a cause as that of the true Church of Jesus Christ."

"I trust most sincerely that you would," replied he. "I was speaking, however, of other enemies besides men. The troubles I meant were those coming more immediately from the devil and from your own heart. But come, we will say no more of this just now. Enjoy yourself, my dear Morley, to your heart's content; only take my word for it, that with all your past troubles and present joys, there is both trial and peace before you, such as now you can little comprehend. And now, good bye; for I am off some six or seven miles, to keep an engagement."

He shook my hand with the heartiest fervour, and we parted at his door.

Till this day I had been a visitor in the priest's house, and I had not yet seen my father since my reception. I hastened home, Cumberland's words still sounding in my ears, though they made little impression on my heart, so overflowing it was with satisfaction and happiness. Nerving myself for my first interview with my father, I hurried into the library, where I heard he was sitting, and almost started to find in full converse with him my old friend Churchill. My father's welcome was somewhat agitated, but decidedly cordial; and I felt that I had not lost my place in his heart. Churchill's salutation puzzled me more. He stared at me as if he were looking at some strange species of monster from the tropics. I had never seen his open handsome countenance look so little agreeable; and his shake of my hand, though not formal, was unquestionably somewhat cold. We all three felt ill at ease, and were forced to talk of the weather as soon as my curiosity respecting Churchill's movements was gratified. With his sister Edith he was on a visit in the immediate neighbourhood of Morley Court, and had, in fact, arrived only the day before. Just as the temperature of the atmosphere was ceasing to afford matter for conversation, my father was called out of the room on some business. The moment

the door closed after him, Churchill looked me in the face, and exclaimed :

"Is it really true, Morley, that you've been fool enough to turn Catholic?"

"Not that I have been *fool* enough," I rejoined; "it is true that I have been wise enough to do so."

"And it's all over and settled, I suppose," he continued, with a frown.

"I was received a few days ago by the priest who used to attend my mother," said I.

"A curse on all your priests!" he cried, rising from his chair and beginning to pace the room.

I looked at him with amazement; the recollection of his former "liberality," as it was called, to Catholics having little prepared me for such a display of animosity. For a few moments he said nothing, and then turning towards me, resumed:

"Well, Morley, I can only say that you are the last man in the world I should have expected to sacrifice your position in society and prospects in life for a nonsensical superstition. I don't wonder at women being gulled by the priests, with their tender natures and weak heads; but how *you* can throw away every thing in this idiotic manner, I can't conceive."

"Really, Churchill," I replied, "you are giving me merits to which I have no claim. Whatever sacrifices other people may make in becoming Catholics, *I* have made little, for I am sure I have not forfeited my father's love; and if he is satisfied, who else has a right to complain?"

"Who else, my dear fellow?" cried Churchill. "Are you such a simpleton as not to see that you have utterly lost caste in society; that, with the best prospects, you are throwing yourself away; that you, an English gentleman, are joining an obscure sect of fanatics, or fools, or something worse; and all for what, let me ask? Don't you see that you are certain to be cut dead by every body, or at least cold-shouldered, and that your future life is a blank; unless," he went on, with a bitter smile, "you intend to turn priest, or Jesuit, or some such worthy completion to your mad beginning."

"As to losing caste," cried I, half angry and half astonished, "do you forget, Churchill, that all England once was Catholic? and even now some of the oldest English families are Catholics still."

"Pooh, pooh!" cried he; "that's all very well for those who were born Catholics, and for very shame can't renounce the creed of their ancestors; we tolerate *them*, but you know we *only* tolerate them. And they are in quite a different condition from people who actually *turn* Catholics, when they

have been brought up Protestants. Depend upon it, the world will have mighty little to say to *you*, my dear fellow, for the future. We have just seen a pretty instance of it in our own family ——”

“Why, what *can* you mean?” I exclaimed, interrupting him.

“Only this,” said Churchill: “that my sister Edith has just turned Papist, like you, and caused my father and me most excessive annoyance, besides rendering a certain object I had in view more difficult to attain than ever.”

“Your sister Edith a Catholic!” I rejoined, amazed.

“Yes, the silly girl,” he said; “and as pretty a specimen of the fanatical enthusiast she makes as you would wish to see. Confound the girls! why on earth can’t they be satisfied with the religions they are brought up in, and leave mysterious questions to wiser heads than theirs?”

“The girls!” I echoed; “what girls? You only spoke of one.”

“Why, Helen Darnley, my cousin, to be sure,” said Churchill. “There’s no use making any secrets between us, and you know pretty well, I suspect, already, that there’s been a sort of engagement between Helen and me for some time past; and now this absurd whim of Edith’s has come in and made matters harder to manage than ever.”

“Really, Churchill,” I rejoined, “I don’t understand you. How in the world can your sister’s conversion to your cousin’s religion make it harder for you to marry your cousin than before? I should have thought it would be quite the reverse.”

“That’s just because you know nothing about the difference that I was telling you of, between being born a Catholic and turning Catholic. My father was coming round about my marrying Helen, till this confounded move of Edith’s came in and marred all my hopes. My father’s perfectly outrageous about Edith, and now he’ll scarcely speak to Helen when he meets her. If it was not that I was so angry myself, I could almost laugh at his horror of priests and monks, and the way he suspects that Edith herself has somehow been turned into a concealed Jesuit. There certainly is something most detestable about this Popery, that it should drive kind-hearted and sensible men like my father absolutely frantic, and make indescribable fools of them. And you know this, and yet you are senseless enough to go and join these Papists, and keep up this detestable ill-will, breeding family quarrels in all directions, and ——”

“Come, come, Churchill,” I interposed, “this is too bad.

It's not we who breed the quarrels, but you, and those who are on your side. You say every man has a right to his own religious opinions, and yet when any one becomes a Catholic, you turn round upon him and kick him on every side."

"So he has a right," cried Churchill, "but not so as to disturb society and the peace of families. What right has any man, I say, to do this?"

"Every man has a right to obey almighty God," said I.

"Stuff and nonsense!" exclaimed Churchill; "who wants you not to obey almighty God? Do you mean to say it is obeying almighty God to set a daughter against her father, and destroy all the natural feelings of the heart?"

"My dear Churchill," said I, "do be reasonable. If the father is wrong and the daughter right, do you say that the daughter ought to obey the father?"

"But who is to settle which is right and which is wrong?" asked Churchill snappishly, with that determined perverseness which I began to see possessed him. I therefore answered him with another question.

"Is there no way of finding out the difference between right and wrong?" said I.

"Oh, as to that," said he, more sharply than ever, "I can't argue the question. When a person is once determined to have his own way, there is no use in reasoning with him. Here are you and Edith, obstinately following your own whims and turning Papists; there is my father, as obstinate as either of you, refusing to listen to reason, talking about Helen as if she was a poisoner or a mad woman, and raving about bloody Queen Mary and Guy Fawkes; and there is Helen herself, nearly as great a fool as any one, catching scruples from my very pious sister Edith, and protesting she can't marry me in defiance of the rules of the Catholic Church. Between you all, I shall be driven mad."

"I don't understand you," I rejoined; "what scruples? what rules of the Church? There is nothing to prevent a Catholic marrying a Protestant, with a dispensation of course; at least so I conclude, though I have been so short a time a Catholic that I may be mistaken."

"Marry! yes, to be sure," cried Churchill; "we may marry soon enough, I have no doubt. It's these absurd rules about the children being brought up Catholics that stand in the way. I never suspected that Helen stood in such awe of the priests until now, but nothing on earth will move her. She declares she *cannot* violate a single law of her Church even for my sake."

"But why can't *you* agree to her wishes?" said I.

"So I would in a moment, though grievously against the grain, I assure you, Morley," he answered. "It's my father that stands out. He won't hear of it on these conditions. I might have got him round before, but now he's so enraged about Edith that it's perfectly hopeless to think of persuading him; and of course marrying without his consent is out of the question."

I was astonished at hearing Churchill say this, for I had never suspected him of any romantic or rigid notions of filial obedience, and in as polite terms as I could think of, I expressed my surprise.

"Oh," said he in reply, "don't give me credit for any thing marvellously good or obedient. I can't marry without my father's consent, because the Brookfield estate is not entailed, and my father might, and would, leave it all away from me. I have only about three hundred a year of my own, and Helen not quite so much; so that marriage would be out of the question."

"Out of the question?" I echoed.

"Yes, of course," said he. "I should not be such a fool as to condemn myself for life to five or six hundred a year, and blast all my prospects just when they are brightest, even for Helen, much as I love her, and long as I have loved her. You stare, my dear Morley; but it's only because you always were as romantic as you now are grown pious, that you wonder at hearing me speak common sense."

"Common sense!" I again echoed, as much amazed at Churchill's sentiments on love as at his sentiments on religion.

"Yes, common sense, to be sure," he rejoined. "Would *you* have me give up Brookfield and my whole position in life, and sit down in a corner, a poor gentleman, with his wife in a cotton gown and some ten or a dozen bread-and-butter children to look after? I see you would give up every thing for your religion; but come, tell me honestly whether you would do this for love."

"Really," cried I, now laughing at this astonishing outburst from an ardent lover, "all that is a matter of taste. There are plenty of people who get on very well with five or six hundred a year; and if that was the *only* objection, I don't quite see how you would be an object deserving of such very tender pity."

By this time Churchill had worked himself up to such a pitch of ill humour that further conversation was impossible, and he soon took his leave and rode away.

"Edith Churchill a Catholic!" said I to myself, again and again, as I wandered through my old haunts that same after-

noon. Somewhat to my trouble, my father was engaged all the day, and I could see nothing of him; so I passed several hours in strolling through the woods and gardens, indulging in all the intense delight of my new-found circumstances. All seemed bright and brilliant before me. The desire for worldly distinction, my old idol, with all its painful excitements, had passed away, or seemed to have passed away. A calmer and more satisfying existence lay open before me. The storms of unbelief, the harassing contradictions of Protestantism, were alike gone; I felt the exquisite *repose* of faith; I closed my eyes for minutes together to reflect on the glories of that unseen world now laid open to my soul. All around and within wore a smile. My dear mother's image rose before me, radiant with the hope of faith, as I had seen it in her last hours. I thought over all she had done for me, and suffered for me, and prayed for me. Tears burst from my eyes; and overwhelmed with a sense of my own unworthiness, and (as I feared) my long resistance to the call of divine grace, I threw myself on my knees in a secluded part of the garden, and gave thanks to God for bearing with me so mercifully, and for the ineffable gift with which He had at length blessed me. Then, as I wandered on, all the happiness of my lot, in the kind forbearance of my father, poured in upon my meditations. Every thing seemed sunshine. Who could have suffered less than I had in embracing the faith of the true Church? Cumberland's warnings passed away from my mind; or if they recurred to me for a few moments, it was only to excite a sensation of incredulity that life could be any thing but joyous to a Catholic.

The next day I rode over to Winterton, the village where Churchill and his sister were staying with their friend, an old maiden lady bearing the name of Englefield, with whom I had a slight acquaintance myself. She had known Edith and Edward Churchill from their infancy, and, in fact, regarded them with almost a mother's affection. Kind-hearted to every human being and every dumb animal, she had made Churchill and his sister the special objects of her affection, and felt their troubles almost as much as if they were her own. She had asked Edith to pay her a visit almost immediately after hearing that she had become a Catholic, with a view of removing her from her father's daily sight until he should be a little more reconciled to her change of religion. The same kindness had prompted her to extend the invitation afterwards to Helen Darnley, whose engagement to Churchill she was acquainted with. She had heard something of the difficulties that stood in the way of the marriage; and unaffectedly desir-

ing to bring all parties to understand one another, and to make every body happy, she had pressed Helen so warmly to come, that she had arrived at Winterton on the previous evening. All this I learnt from subsequent conversations with Edith, for I had no suspicion who I was going to meet when I was ushered into Miss Englefield's drawing-room, with the full expectation of seeing none but the hostess, Edith, and Churchill himself.

I found, however, the three ladies and no gentleman, and a warm greeting from them all soon set me at my ease. Helen made no secret of her satisfaction at my conversion; Edith looked her sympathies; but as for myself, I ventured not to say a word on the subject, not knowing whether it might not annoy Miss Englefield.

"Well, my dears," said Miss Englefield, as soon as the formalities of greeting were past, "I suppose our conversation may go on. No doubt your friend Mr. Morley is in the secret, and we need not be afraid of him. Now he is of your religion, perhaps he will be able to help you a little with Edward's father."

"Ah, my dear Miss Englefield," cried Helen, "you don't know Mr. Churchill as well as I do. You are so kind, you never think harm of any body; but it's not so with other people. Mr. Churchill *hates* the Catholic religion; and now Edith has become a Catholic, he is worse than ever. I have not the least doubt that he would like nothing so well as to see every thing given up between his son and myself."

"Why, my dear," cried the old lady, "you astonish me. Did not Mr. Churchill agree to your engagement, and he always knew that you were a Catholic?"

"Ah," said Helen, sadly shaking her head, "it was only because I was a strange sort of Catholic, and kept my religion to myself. Now that he has found out the power of the Catholic religion, I see too plainly that he has an absolute horror of me."

"Well, well," responded Miss Englefield, "I don't understand it at all. I can't understand why people can't agree and be happy together, and make concessions when they don't agree. It's a sad pity, these troubles in families about religion; it never used to be so in my young days. And the longer I live, the more happy I am that I belong to the good old-fashioned Church of England."

Edith here rose, and seeing tears in the kind-hearted old lady's eyes, threw her arms round her neck and kissed her.

"Dear, dear Miss Englefield," she said, "pray don't take it to heart so. You know it makes no difference in our affection and respect for you. And surely you will admit that

when eternity is at stake, all family considerations *must* give way."

"You're a dear good girl, Edith," said Miss Englefield, "whatever you are, but you let your feelings run away with you sometimes. What do you and I know about eternity, or any such mysterious subjects?"

"Not about eternity!" echoed Edith. "But suppose I should do that which would send me to eternal torments."

"O my dear Edith!" exclaimed Miss Englefield, "don't talk about any thing so dreadful. You can never go to eternal torments; why we must hope that nobody will come to such a dreadful end; and as to a sweet innocent child like you, it's really foolish of you to talk in such a way. Who *can* have put such notions into your head? I hope it's none of your new priests that have done it."

"Why, don't *you* believe in the doctrine of eternal punishments?" cried Edith, amazed; "I thought all Church-of-England people believed in them."

"My dear, it's a very mysterious and awful subject," said Miss Englefield, evidently getting uncomfortable; "and I don't think it's a thing that young women, or old ones either, can understand much about. I can't believe myself that any of the creatures of our merciful God will suffer so dreadfully, especially after suffering as so many of them do in this life."

"But, dear Miss Englefield," interposed Helen, "surely this very suffering that so many endure in this life, without, as it seems, any fault of their own, rather shews that we cannot understand God's pleasure about them hereafter. All we can do is to believe what He tells us."

"Well, well, my dears," said the old lady, "don't let us get into an argument. It's bad enough as it is, having all these troubles with poor Edward and his father, without making things worse than they need be."

Edith sighed, grieved, as I saw plainly, at her kind-hearted friend's ideas about religion; Helen looked the picture of perplexity and distress; and I sat wondering, and looking, I suspect, not a little foolish. Miss Englefield then left the room, and a long conversation followed between Edith, Helen, and myself. How well I can still recall the exquisite sense of gratification with which I received their congratulations on my conversion, and how speedily my former feelings of friendship with Edith revived! My old attachment, real or imaginary, for Miss Darnley had of course long passed away; and as she shewed not the slightest embarrassment at meeting me, I was able composedly to admire the remarkable vigour and genuineness of her character, and the simple-hearted guileless-

ness with which she talked of her prospects with regard to Churchill. I had always been a favourite with Churchill's father; and my long friendship with Churchill himself, added to the circumstance that I was now a Catholic, constituted me a kind of friend of all parties, and prevented that reserve which would have been otherwise natural in such cases. The fact also was, that matters were becoming so pressing that it was absolutely necessary that *something* should be decided. In the course of the conversation, I learnt that Churchill had underrated, if any thing, his father's indignation; and that Edith was growing seriously uncomfortable about her brother's conduct itself. Helen, indeed, would not hear a word to the disparagement of Churchill's honour and affection; but that she was far from thoroughly at ease, I shrewdly suspected. I went away with my first suspicions that even to a Catholic this life is not without its bitter trials.

During the next few weeks all went on as uncomfortably between Helen and her lover as could be imagined. I was repeatedly at Miss Englefield's, where I soon found I was welcome at all hours. The warm-hearted old lady was annoyed beyond description at the state of things, and was beginning to lose all patience with Edward Churchill. As for myself, it was not long before the natural result of my frequent visits took place. What young man in a thousand is there who, with all the world before him as bright as he could desire, and enjoying the peace of one who at length is at rest in the thought of eternity, would not have done as I did, when day after day he sat and talked and walked with such a person as Edith Churchill? Of course I soon fell in love with her, and began to experience all the pangs and palpitations of doubt and hope. I shall not trouble my readers with the course of what proved to be in the end "true love" on both sides, and which for once "ran smooth" as heart could desire. The whole progress of our affection was as prosaic as prosperity could make it, and supplied little worth recording except in its results.

Some weeks, however, before I ventured to speak openly to Edith, the course of my friend Churchill's engagement took a turn which made me tremble lest some unforeseen mischance should blight my own hopes when nearest their blossoming. Churchill had been away for a short time on a visit in London, and was just returned, plainly more passionately in love than ever with worldly wealth and position in society. From the first day when I had seen him at Miss Englefield's in company with Helen, I had begun to observe the utter incompatibility of her increasing devotion to her religion with his

growing love for the world. Shortly after his return from town, I called one day early in the morning, and found him walking up and down a broad avenue in the pleasure-grounds, his countenance knit into a stiff iron look of anger and discomfort. He scarcely answered my salutation; and taking a letter out of his pocket, thrust it into my hands, and bade me read it. It was as follows:

“My dear Edward,—I have consulted some of my most valued friends on the subject of your letter; and have come to the conclusion that it will be for your happiness entirely to give up your engagement with Miss Darnley. I never will consent to allow the possessions of my ancestors to fall into the hands of Papists and their priests. At the same time, as you knew her religion at the time you formed the engagement, and as I am sensible that I did not take sufficiently stringent measures to prevent it, I do not absolutely withhold my consent, as your father, to your marriage itself. I will still treat you as my son, and receive Miss Darnley as my daughter, in every respect but that of bestowing on you any portion of my property. You inherit a certain sum from your mother, and Miss Darnley has some property of her own. If you think proper to marry upon this, I give my approval; *but that is all*. Be so good as to communicate with Miss Darnley without loss of time, and let me know the result, as I shall immediately make my will, and dispose of all I possess in some quarter where it can by no possibility be employed in the service of Popery.

“Your affectionate father,

“GEORGE CHURCHILL.

“P.S. I will thank you to inform your sister of the arrangement I am about to make. As she inherits, like yourself, a sufficiency for her personal support, she is to expect nothing from me, either during my life or at my death.”

I folded the letter up and returned it to Churchill.

“Well, Morley,” said he, with a frown, “your supposition has come true. What have you to say to it?”

“Three months ago,” said I, “on the reading such a letter, I should have asked what day was to be fixed for your marriage. And now I can hardly conceive your taking but one course, as a man of honour.”

“It’s easy for *you* to talk of honour, Morley,” cried he, “who have nothing on earth at stake. Do you mean to tell me that I am *bound* not to give up the engagement?”

“To tell you the truth, Churchill,” said I, “I begin to

question whether it would not be for Miss Darnley's happiness to have nothing more to say to you. I would give little for her prospects of married life with a man who could even *doubt* what he would do in such an alternative as your father puts before you. I can only say, that if your affection cannot subsist upon the very tolerable fortune you would have though your father cut you off with a shilling, the sooner Miss Darnley and you part the better."

"Really, Morley," said Churchill, "your romantic notions are absolutely absurd. Do you really think it nothing to lose such an estate as Brookfield, and every farthing else that will go with it? Do you mean to tell me that I shall not be doing Helen herself an injury, by marrying her with not a sixth of the fortune she expected to have?"

"Splendid logic, indeed," I replied. "It's to be a smaller injury to Miss Darnley to jilt her, than to marry her with a small income. Come, come, Churchill, this will hardly do; whatever you do, be honest, and avow your real motives."

"Would Helen herself say differently," rejoined he, "if she saw my father's letter, and I said I would do just what *she* wished?"

"For shame, for shame!" I cried; "you surely will not be so base as to give *her* the choice. What woman with any delicacy of feeling or true affection would take the hand of a man who could insult her with such a mockery? No, Churchill; if you mean to give up Helen, do it as decently as possible. Don't add insult and duplicity to a grievous injury. Don't throw the burden of the decision on her, when you know you will be bitterly disappointed unless she takes the side you would take if you decided for yourself. I tell you honestly, I think your feelings more shameful than I like to say; but *having* so little real regard for Miss Darnley, it is plain enough that it is for her happiness to have done with you."

How Churchill came to take all this from me as quietly as he did, I could not tell; but he bore my rebukes wonderfully patiently. Certainly he did listen to this, and much more in the same strain, and replied with great ill humour indeed, but still without openly quarrelling with me. I saw how it would end, and I was so disgusted that I had not the heart to enter the house, but rode home immediately.

The following morning found me again at Miss Englefield's. The old lady was alone in the drawing-room, pacing to and fro in a high state of agitation. She greeted me bluntly, but warmly. In a minute or two Churchill entered, looking sulky and shamefaced.

"Sit down at this table, if you please, Mr. Churchill,"

said Miss Englefield, in a sharper tone of voice than I had ever heard from her lips.

"Mr. Morley, I am glad you are come. It is desirable that there should be some witness to the business I have to do this morning; and it is better that it should be a *gentleman*" (and she laid special stress on the word) "than one who is not so, whether by birth or feeling."

Churchill turned ashy pale at her words, but said nothing.

"May I ask you to ring the bell, Mr. Morley?" continued Miss Englefield.

I obeyed. The servant entered.

"Put some wood on the fire, James," said Miss Englefield, "wood that will burn up immediately."

In a minute the flames were crackling up brightly in the grate. Miss Englefield took a chair and sat down at the table, on which lay a writing-desk, close to Churchill.

"Sit down here, Mr. Morley," she resumed, "close to me on this side."

I did so. She took a key, unlocked the desk and drew out a paper packet, opened it, and laid it on the table before her.

"Edward Churchill," she continued, "be so good as to read this paper from beginning to end; and do you, Mr. Morley, read it through at the same time. It is my will. The contents will perhaps surprise you."

We read it throughout. It was short, and bequeathed nearly the whole of her property, amounting to about fifty thousand pounds, to Edward and Edith Churchill, in equal parts. As soon as we had finished, she folded it up loosely, took it in her hand, and stood up.

"Edward Churchill," she began, "you have made your choice; I have made mine. You have treated Miss Helen Darnley as no gentleman would treat a lady; you have tried to excuse yourself to me by affecting to have motives which I know have no weight with you. Your father has behaved, though like a tyrant as I think, yet at least like a gentleman, or at any rate on conscientious grounds. He has given you your choice between Miss Darnley and Brookfield Manor; you have chosen the last. It is the bitterest moment of my life to see you thus dishonoured. You have just read what were *my* intentions respecting you, but you will hardly be surprised if they are now changed. I have but one word more: if you hope to gain *happiness* by acting on such principles as you have now betrayed, you will find your expectations shrivel into ashes, as surely as this paper is now burnt to dust."

And she laid the will in the flames, and in a few moments it was consumed. She rang the bell loudly.

"Are the horses ready, James?" she said, as the servant entered.

"Yes, ma'am," said the man.

"The carriage will take you to meet the coach, Mr. Churchill," continued the old lady. "You cannot be a visitor in my house any longer."

Churchill looked thunderstruck. He turned pale and red, then pale again; then started from his seat; stared, as if trying to frame some words, and dashed out of the room.

"Sit still, Mr. Morley, I desire," cried Miss Englefield, as I made a motion to go after him. I was so amazed, that I obeyed like a child. Presently I heard the rattle of the carriage-wheels, then in a little while the sound of Churchill's feet in the hall, then the carriage drove off, and the house-door was shut. As soon as the sound of the wheels had died away, the poor old lady sank back upon a sofa, and with a loud cry of pain swooned away.

"CHURCHES" VERSUS "ROOMS."

WHEN certain modern critics wish to express their contempt for an ecclesiastical building in some phrase which shall combine the force of argument with the force of satire, they call it a "room." Just in the same way, men who know nothing of Gothic architecture condemn it as "gloomy," "extravagantly dear," and "incapable of adaptation to present necessities;" or select the crypt of some old cathedral, or some unhappy and expensive failure of the last ten or fifteen years, as the very type of Gothic art, to which every man who does not like round arches is fated by the laws of necessity to conform himself. One day you will hear a "Goth" scarcely checking himself from calling St. Peter's a "room," or (as has been wittily suggested) finding fault with the rainbow because it is not a pointed arch. The next day you shall marvel at hearing a Gothic chasuble described very much as the invention of the devil; or at listening to a discourse on church-architecture founded on the idea that in the thirteenth century people believed that all angels had wry necks.

So it is in musical matters. If we say that there are portions of plain-chant which are the most exquisite examples of religious melody in existence, we are suspected of a secret desire to reduce the songs of the Church to the funereal level

of a perpetual "plain-song." Or if we venture to hint that a Gregorian *Gloria* is not exactly provocative of emotions of joy and thankfulness, some scandalised listener whispers hints as to our love for the imported abominations of the opera-house.

In the mean time the *art* itself, whether of music or of architecture, suffers; and with it, to a certain extent, the interests of religion itself. Hardly any thing is done thoroughly well, because almost every body is more busy with his own crotchets, than with *employing* art as the handmaid of religion, in a simple, unpretending, genuine way. Scarcely a new church is raised which does not incidentally cause more heart-burning than gratification, and which does not most needlessly disappoint expectation. Hardly any body knows thoroughly what he wants, or what he can attain. Architects and church-builders assume the relation of "natural enemies:" the architect despises his "patrons" (we use the word in no offensive sense), as knowing nothing about art, and lamentably given to calculation and stinginess; the "patrons" are suspicious of the architect (unless, as in some instances, they regard him as a sort of infallible demi-god), and think he is to be watched as a mouse is watched by a cat. And so on in sculpture, painting, decoration, and every other detail in which artistic and mechanical skill are called in to give honour to the public worship of almighty God. We look upon this violent opposition between "Goth" and "anti-Goth" as one of the most fatal hindrances to the cultivation of *all* ecclesiastical architecture which exists. So long as it prevails, it renders impossible that fair, impartial, good-humoured criticism which is essential to any advance in art. So long as a critic's chief thought is, whether the arches are round or pointed, and not whether the work he sees is good of its kind and answers the purpose for which it is intended, so long in place of friendly discussions we shall have only party squabbles, in place of kindly and just criticisms only personal imputations, and in place of truly creditable structures and decorations only a repetition of works which are for a time vehemently eulogised or vehemently abused, and in the end give complete satisfaction to *nobody*.

Against this narrow bigotry we have ourselves never ceased earnestly to protest, ridiculing it and arguing against it to the utmost of our power. The subject is still full of interest; for notwithstanding the present lull in the erection of new churches in England, they must soon again begin to multiply; while in Ireland the study of ecclesiological art is already shewing signs of youthful vigour. Should it please God to give to Ireland a few years' freedom from famine and pesti-

lence, and should she be enabled to defy the malice of her Protestant persecutors, we expect to see a rapid increase in the number of her new churches, and no little advance in the character of her ecclesiastical decorations and general outward splendour. It will not therefore be without interest to our readers if we once more return to the subject, and occupy a few minutes in dissecting one of the most popular and unmeaning of the phrases of the day, and inquire what *is* the difference between a "church" and a "room."

A "church," then, is not a building of any one peculiar shape, or plan, or style of architecture; square, or oblong, or round; built of wood, or stone, or lath and plaster, or brick; with columns or without columns; with galleries or without; a "church" is a building constructed with the special view of enabling Christians to worship God as the Catholic Church directs them in their public assemblies. A "room" is a building constructed with the special view of enabling persons to sit in it, to eat in it, to study in it, to cook in it, to sleep in it, to paint in it, to dance in it, to sing and play in it, or for any other of those secular actions which fill up our indoor life. To call a building with a nave, aisles, and transepts, a "church," and a plain oblong edifice a "room," is simply nonsensical. The glasshouse built for the Hyde-Park Exhibition has nave, aisles, and transepts; yet no one in his senses would call it *either* a room or a church. The old Roman courts of justice had nave, aisles, and (what we now call) a chancel; yet a modern "room"-hater will not hear of them as models for Christian architects. Some of the most beautiful specimens of the mediæval chapels are in plan and design almost identical with the large dining-halls of the same period; yet nobody thinks of laughing at them as "rooms." And why were they thus like? Merely because in certain cases the same shape and general design which was best adapted for the dining-room was also best adapted for the chapel. If a "room" means a plain oblong structure, without columns or arches, and a row of windows down the sides, then hundreds of the old Gothic parish churches are "rooms," or rather parts of "rooms," consisting of a big room opening into a little room. In fact, if a man were compelled to make his choice out of all the buildings in existence devoted to Catholic public worship, in order to use it as a "room" for the purposes of his daily life, there can be no doubt that the very last things he would select would be the modern churches of Italy, France, and other Catholic countries, and that his predilections would fall upon some Gothic church of the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

What conceivable affinity, on the other hand, is there between a "room" and the Church of the Pantheon at Rome, that *circular* building, the thought of whose form sets some of our prudish antiquarians a-shuddering with pious horror? For ourselves, little as we should like to see all churches round—and be it remembered that there are certain *medieval* churches which are as round as the Pantheon—we have rarely seen a church, Gothic or Italian, which has impressed us with such a sense of devout solemnity as that glorious old Pantheon, whence the true God has banished the idol of the heathen, and which, though erected for the service of Satan, has become the temple of Jesus Christ; as the human body, born in sin and the slave of hell, is regenerated by the consecrating waters and made the temple of the living God.

It is obvious, in the next place, that what was a *good* church in one period of Christianity, may be no longer a good church at a later date. As the externals of Catholic worship have been frequently modified and changed, it is evident that the actual building in which this worship is to be offered must, if it really is to serve the purpose it is designed for, be modified and changed too. So it is in real "rooms." Man's domestic and social life is ever the same in its essence; but in its external forms and customs it is susceptible of innumerable variations, according to the changes in civilisation, age, and climate. Take one of the rooms from Pompeii, whether the sleeping-rooms or the rooms for the day, and transplant it into London or Paris. You might as well bid every house-builder model his drawing-room after the cells in Newgate; yes, and much better. The cells in a nineteenth-century gaol would supply the wants of our modern life much better than the best apartments of Greece and Rome eighteen hundred years ago.

In a word, a church ought to be a *home* for Catholic public worship, as a private house is a man's home in all that regards his temporal existence. The essential qualification of a design for a "church" ought, therefore, to be its exact adaptation to the wants and customs of Catholic worship at the time when it is erected. If it fails in this, it is not a "church" *nor* a "room," but that most contemptible of shams, a "modern antique," a "ruin," set up by some London Cockney in his suburban villa garden, imitating with its battlements and bow-and-arrow holes the defences of an ancient castle. A church is a building for *use*, and not for being merely looked at; just like a house, or a coat, or a pair of shoes, or a carriage. It *may be* beautiful besides, and if possible, it ought to be, as no religious man will doubt. No Catholic ever dreams of

doubting the propriety of making the house of God as glorious as circumstances will allow, though he may question whether it is for the glory of God that he should run largely into debt. What we assert is simply, that the *first* thing to be considered in building a new church is, not whether the design is beautiful, but whether it is really adapted to the rubrics, customs, and ceremonies of the Catholic Church of this present day ; the second thing to be considered is, whether it is beautiful to the eye ; the third is, whether we can pay for it. If it fails in the first of these requisites, it is not a " church," and it is not a " room ;" it is a toy and a sham.

The subject of the above remarks suggests to us the advisableness of replying here to the expressions of disappointment which we have received from various quarters, in consequence of our passing by Mr. Pugin's two last publications without notice. His *Earnest Address on the Hierarchy* and his book on Screens have seemed to many of our readers to demand a review in a journal which has so frequently handled the subjects which Mr. Pugin discusses. We have had but one reason for abstaining from noticing them, viz. their personal attacks on the Editor of the *Rambler* and his contributors. When a Catholic broadly states that he wishes persons who do not share his architectural views to *apostatise from the faith* ; when he asserts that screens were attacked in the *Rambler*, in order to make that journal sell ; and when he compares the conduct of its Editor to that of the Jews who cried out for the crucifixion of our Blessed Lord,—any thing like a review of the publications in which such statements occur becomes out of the question.

That, in common with most other Catholics, we have been shocked at Mr. Pugin's sympathies with the Anglican heresy, and at the language with which he has spoken of bishops, ecclesiastics, and nuns, simply because their artistic tastes differed from his own, is most true. Yet we have been little surprised at such a development of Mr. Pugin's theories. We have ever regarded Puginism as identical with Puseyism. It condemns the living Catholic Church in a manner which appears wholly inconsistent with a belief in her infallibility, and flies back to some past period, when her judges imagine her to have come up to *their* standard of perfection. Mr. Pugin's pamphlet has, therefore, been naturally hailed with delight by the Puseyites in the Established Church, and has become a greater scandal than any thing which has for a long time past taken place among us. For *their* sakes, indeed, it might

possibly have been better that we should have referred to Mr. Pugin's theories, as many of them do us the favour (so rarely accorded by Anglicans to Catholic writers) to read our pages. We may assure them, then, if not too late, that Mr. Pugin's views respecting the Reformation and Anglicanism are repudiated by every Catholic theologian in every part of Christendom; that there can be no doubt that his pamphlet would be placed on the *Index* if delated to Rome; and that it is only the knowledge that Mr. Pugin's extravagances supply their own best antidote which (as we are informed) has prevented parties in England from calling the attention of the Holy Office to the sentiments he has published.

Reviews.

LEIGH HUNT'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt; with Reminiscences of Friends and Contemporaries. In 3 vols. Smith, Elder, and Co.

WHAT may not be expected from a man who disbelieves in Christianity and believes in Lord John Russell? From a mind thus afflicted with obliquity of vision one can hardly be surprised at receiving three volumes of autobiography, of which five-sixths have about as much connexion with the life of the "autobiographer" as M. Soyer's *Gastronomic Regenerator* with the science of natural history. The *Autobiography of Leigh Hunt* is as impudent a specimen of manufacture as professional *littérateur* ever palmed upon the public. Late in life it has been Mr. Hunt's fortune to acquire a certain measure of popularity. Victimised in his youth by a royal Bluebeard, he has been petted a little by the literary and reading world, now that he has learnt better manners to monarchs, and the dispensers of Treasury bounty have become "illustrious" in his eyes. Not that we mean that Mr. Hunt took to praising King William, Queen Victoria, and our present "illustrious" premier, with any deliberate view to a gift of four hundred pounds from the Bounty-fund, or an annual hundred from the Pension-list; far from it. The subsidence of the caustic editor of the *Examiner* into a writer of courtly verses and sentences redolent of his "lordship," is but the natural lapse of an intellect more lively than vigorous, coupled

with a moral nature which could print such an opinion as this: "I certainly think little of the habit of swearing, however idle, if it be carried no further than is done by many gallant and very good men, wise and great ones not excepted."

Nor do we think that Mr. Hunt's pension is ill-bestowed, on the principle on which *all* English pensions are bestowed. A man who had been so infamously used by a Tory king and administration had a kind of right to some acknowledgment of gratitude from the party whom he served, and for whom he suffered, when they came to have the control of the Pension-list. And it is but a fresh proof of the hollowness of Whig professions, when we see Lord Melbourne admitting Mr. Hunt's claims, yet refusing the pension he needed, because it was not proper that a man who had been found guilty of libelling one sovereign should be pensioned by another! Truly, Whig squeamishness is as unintelligible as Whig liberality.

Except in his politics and his cleverness, we must, however, do Mr. Hunt the justice to admit that he is the same as ever. He still thinks the atheist Shelley a "religious" man. He tells us that the Athanasian creed is "impious." His notions on purity are on a level with his notions on swearing. He can tolerate every thing except the doctrines of the Christian faith. And as to his own belief (so to call a mere negation), he tells us over and over again that the one great thing to be believed and taught is, that there is no hell.

For the rest, he is here, as in his other later productions, easy and smooth in style, with an occasional imaginative sparkle; discriminating, though shallow, in his criticisms; dainty even in his immorality; and perpetually telling the world how cheerful are his opinions, how he loves to mingle "philosophy and the belles lettres" with the rough realities of life, how pleased he is with every thing and every body, and how he hopes to shake hands with his past antagonists in "the Elysian fields," till we cry out "methinks the lady doth protest too much," and begin to suspect that, after all, Mr. Hunt's chief cheerfulness consists in informing other people how amiable he is, and that a more absurdly self-conscious and egotistical man does not exist in the whole race of minor poets.

Little as we love Mr. Hunt's earlier writings, we think them infinitely preferable to the milk-and-water, lackadaisical, and sawny sentimentalism of his later years. When benevolence takes to puffing itself, and scepticism begins to twaddle, the compound is such that none but an age which believes in nothing could give it a place among articles saleable.

Whether, indeed, this "Autobiography" has proved saleable, we cannot tell; but we suspect that a few more such

impositions will prove too much even for our present public. Mr. Hunt altogether made a mistake when he agreed with his publishers to write his own life in three volumes. Three chapters would have told us all that he has here related respecting himself, and a couple more would have finished off all the reminiscences of his friends and contemporaries which were worth putting on paper. Of the most interesting feature in his history—the progress of the *Examiner*—he has given us but a fragmentary and incomplete sketch; and what might have proved a really valuable episode in the political history of the times is nothing more than a clumsily introduced anecdote in the midst of a wilderness of remarks, and thoughts, and journals, and apologies, and protestations, and criticisms on books and things in general. The *real* literary life of any author of Mr. Hunt's merit and perseverance would always be interesting; its hopes and fears, its pangs and joys, its alternations of success and failure, with all that medley of business and management which constitutes the link between the writer and the bookseller, are generally sufficiently significative and sufficiently full of warning to be worth telling by any person who is content to tell his tale, and his tale only. Such a tale the "Autobiography of Leigh Hunt" is not.

Mr. Hunt's father was an American Protestant clergyman, of loyalist opinions, who came to England at the time of the Revolution, and was celebrated for preaching charity-sermons and reading the Liturgy in the true theatrical style. He was too free with his tongue and with his bottle to get on even in those days of port-wine "orthodoxy." On one occasion, having a warm discussion with some bishop, the prelate asked him "if he knew who he was." "Yes, my Lord," said Mr. Hunt, "dust and ashes."

Leigh Hunt himself was educated at the Blue-Coat School; and if any future maker of books desires to know how to treat the school-days of any person's life with the utmost imaginable longitude, we recommend him to try to get through our autobiographer's disquisitions on his childhood and youth, warning him, however, that he will have to master some 300 pages before he finds Mr. Hunt fairly come to man's estate.

With the account (such as it is) of the course of the *Examiner* newspaper, the autobiographer becomes interesting. He and his brother John set up the paper in 1808; its main objects being (as he tells us) "to assist in producing reform in Parliament, liberality of opinion in general (especially freedom from superstition), and a fusion of literary taste into all subjects whatsoever." As proprietors the brothers were joint partners; but Leigh seems to have been the chief writer. He laboured

hard to write with all the condensed force and wit of the school of Swift, and undoubtedly succeeded in producing many brilliant and powerful articles. Taking the anti-Tory line, of course he was accused of Buonapartism. This he disclaims, and as a proof of his anti-Napoleonic feelings gives the following squib, reprinted from the first number of the *Examiner*.

"NAPOLEON IN HIS CABINET.

SCENE—*A Cabinet at St. Cloud.*

Nap. [*ruminating before a fire and grasping a poker.*] Who waits there?

Le M. May it please your majesty, your faithful soldier, Le Meurtrier.

Nap. Tell Sultan Mustapha that he is the last of the Sultans.

Le M. Yes, sire.

Nap. And, hark ye, desire the King of Holland to come to me directly.

Le M. Yes, sire.

Nap. And the King of Westphalia.—[*Aside*] I must tweak Jerome by the nose a little, to teach him dignity.

Le M. [*with hesitation.*] M. Champagne, sire, waits to know your majesty's pleasure respecting the King of Sweden.

Nap. Oh, tell him I'll let the boy alone for a month or two. And stay, Le Meurtrier; go to the editor of the *Moniteur*, and tell him to dethrone the Queen of Portugal. Spain's dethronement is put off to next year. Where's Bienseance?

[*Exit Le Meurtrier, and enter Bienseance.*]

Bien. May it please your august majesty, Bienseance is before you.

Nap. Fetch me General F.'s head and a cup of coffee.

Bien. [*smiling with devotion.*] Every syllable uttered by the great Napoleon convinces Frenchmen that he is their father.

[*Exit Bienseance.*]

Nap. [*meditating with ferocity.*] After driving the Turks out of Europe [*pokes the fire*], I must annihilate England [*gives a furious poke*]; but first I shall overrun India; then I shall request America and Africa to put themselves under my protection; and after making that great jackass, the Russian Emperor, one of my tributaries, crown myself emperor of the east, west, north, and south. Then I must have a balloon army, of which Garnerin shall be field-marshal; for I must positively take possession of the comet, because it makes a noise. That will assist me to conquer the solar system; and then I shall go with my army to the other systems; and then, I think, I shall go to the devil."

We who live towards what it is to be feared is the close of a long peace, should start to find ourselves suddenly in the midst of the gossip of a generation which estimated military glory at a price now unheard of, save among soldiers. Still,

another *jeu-d'esprit* from the early numbers of the *Examiner*, entitled "Breakfast Sympathies with the Miseries of War," is amusing enough.

"Two Gentlemen and a Lady at breakfast.

A. [*reading the newspaper, and eating at every two or three words.*] 'The combat lasted twelve hours, and the two armies separated at nine in the evening, leaving 30,000 men literally cut to pieces'—another piece of toast, if you please—'on the field of' Stop, 30,000 is it? [*looking at the paper closely*] Egad, I believe it's 50,000. Tom, is that a three or a five?

B. Oh, a five. That paper's horridly printed.

A. Very, indeed. Well, 'leaving 50,000 men on the field of battle.' 50,000! that's a great number to be killed with the bayonet, eh! War's a horrid [*sips*] thing.

The Lady. Oh, shocking! [*takes a large bit of toast.*]

B. Oh, monstrous! [*takes a larger.*]

A. [*reading on.*] 'One of the French generals of division, riding up to the emperor with a sabre covered with blood, after a charge of cavalry, exclaimed,'—stick your fork into that slice of ham for me, Tom—thank'ye—'exclaimed, There is not a man in my regiment whose sword is not like this. The two armi——'

B. What? What was that about the sword?

A. Why, his own sword, you know, was covered with blood. Didn't you hear me read it? And so he said, 'There is not a——'

B. Ay, ay—'whose sword is not like this.' I understand you. Gad, what a fellow!

A. [*sips.*] Oh, horrid!

The Lady. [*sips.*] Oh, shocking! Dash, get down; how can you be so?

A. 'The two armi——'

B. By the by, have you heard of Mrs. W.'s accident?

A. and the Lady. [*putting down their cups.*] No; what can it be?

A. Poor thing! her husband's half mad, I suppose.

B. Why, she has broken her arm.

The Lady. Good God! I declare you've made me quite sick. Poor dear Mrs. W.! Why, she'll be obliged to wear her arm in a sling. But she would go out this slippery weather, when the frost's enough to kill one.

B. Well, I must go and tell my father the news. Let's see—how many men killed, Charles?

A. 50,000.

B. Ah, 50,000. Good morning. [*Exit.*]

The Lady. Poor dear Mrs. W., I can't help thinking about her. A broken arm! Why, it's quite a dreadful thing. I wonder whether Mrs. F. has heard the news.

B. She'll see it in this morning's paper, you know.

Lady. Oh, what it's in the paper, is it?

B. [*laughing.*] Why, didn't you hear Charles read it just now?

Lady. Oh, that news. No, I mean poor Mrs. W. Poor dear!
[*meditating*] I wonder whether she'll wear a black sling or a blue.
[*Exeunt.*"]

The paper had not been established a year when the Government of the day thought it worth while to persecute it. A certain Major Hogan, who had been in the army seventeen years, had been ill used by the War-office; and going straight to the Duke of York, then commander-in-chief, he favoured the Duke with a few such unexpected truths respecting the immoralities and intrigues which helped on the promotion of officers, that the commander-in-chief was unable even to utter a syllable of reply. The Major followed up this attack with a pamphlet, which he was offered a large bribe to suppress. On its appearance the *Examiner* commented on it with a freedom which drew down a government prosecution. A member of Parliament, however, Colonel Wardle, brought forward a motion in the House of Commons for the investigation of the Major's charges; and the Government, in fear, thought it best to drop the prosecution.

Before another year was out, the Tories were again in arms against the Hunts. A certain article in the paper contained the following words: "Of all monarchs since the Revolution, the successor of George the Third will have the finest opportunity of becoming nobly popular." We can hardly conceive a political prosecution now grounded on such a charge. It is only Catholics who are persecuted for saying and doing *nothing* now-a-days. In the good old times it was otherwise, and the *Examiner* was speedily pounced upon by the Attorney-General. This time again it escaped; but a third prosecution consigned Mr. Hunt and his brother to gaol for two years, and made them pay a fine of five hundred pounds a piece. Its origin is thus related:

"There was an annual dinner of the Irish on St. Patrick's day, at which the Prince of Wales's name used to be the reigning and rapturous toast, as that of the greatest friend they possessed in the United Kingdom. He was held to be the jovial advocate of liberality in all things, and sponsor in particular for concession to the Catholic claims. But the Prince of Wales, now become Prince Regent, had retained the Tory ministers of his father; he had broken life-long engagements; had violated his promises, particular as well as general, those to the Catholics among them; and led *in toto* a different political life from what had been expected. The name, therefore, which used to be hailed with rapture, was now, at the dinner in question, received with hisses."

The article in which the *Examiner* gave an account of

this dinner supplied the materials for the Government attack. It is too long to give entire; but as a specimen of the cleverness and finish of Mr. Hunt's political papers, a portion will be welcome. We must prefix to it our "cheerful" infidel's anticipations of his future intercourse with the Regent in that coming state of bliss which he so often tells us awaits himself, with all the sinners and scoundrels who ever spread a blight over the face of the earth. Certainly here *is* Cockney scepticism in its perfection: it is the very bathos of unbelief.

"Could I meet him" (George the Fourth) "in some odd corner of the Elysian fields, where charity had room for both of us, I should first apologise to him for having been the instrument in the hand of events for attacking a fellow-creature, and then expect to hear him avow as hearty a regret for having injured myself, and unjustly treated his wife."

Oh, for some modern Virgil to paint the rencontre of the Regent and his wife, and Lord Brougham, and Leigh Hunt, and Alderman Wood, and all the scandal-mongers and scandal-makers of those happy days, in the bowers of Mr. Hunt's Elysium! Why does not Leigh Hunt himself attempt the task, and become the Dante of the new religion? "Purgatory" and "Hell," of course, he cannot paint; but who so fitting as he to picture the everlasting rewards of the saints of the new calendar, and babble in soft verse the Paradisiacal conversations of the list of heroes whose virtues he has recorded in the closing chapter of his book: "the Lamennais and Robert Owens, the Parkers, the Foxtons, the Newmans," "the Mendelssohns, the Lavaters, the Herders, the Williamses, the Priestleys, the Channings, Adam Clarkes, Halls, Carlyles, Emersons, Hares, Maurices, Whateleys, Foxes, and Vaughans?"

But we return to our poet's views of the same Prince Regent in the year 1812, as expounded in an article called *The Prince on St. Patrick's Day*.

"The Prince Regent is still in every body's mouth; and, unless he is as insensible to biting as to bantering, a delicious time he has of it in that remorseless ubiquity! If a person takes in a newspaper, the first thing he does, when he looks at it, is to give the old groan and say, 'Well, what of the Prince Regent now?' If he goes out after breakfast, the first friend he meets is sure to begin talking about the Prince Regent; and the two always separate with a shrug. He who is lounging along the street will take your arm, and turn back with you to expatiate on the Prince Regent; and he in a hurry, who is skimming the other side of the way, halloo's out as he goes, 'Fine things these of the Prince Regent!' You can scarcely pass by two people talking together but you shall hear

the words 'Prince Regent;'—'if the Prince Regent has done that, he must be—' or such as 'the Prince Regent and Lord Yar—,' the rest escapes in the distance. At dinner the Prince Regent quite eclipses the goose or the calf's-head; the tea-table, of course, rings of the Prince Regent; if the company go to the theatre to see the *Hypocrite*, or the new farce of *Turn Out*, they cannot help thinking of the Prince Regent; and, as Dean Swift extracted philosophical meditation from a broomstick, so it would not be surprising if any serious person, in going to bed, should find in his very nightcap something to remind him of the merits of the Prince Regent. In short, there is no other subject but one that can at all pretend to a place in the attention of our countrymen, and that is their old topic, the weather; their whole sympathies are at present divided between the Prince Regent and the barometer.

'Nocte pluit totâ: redeunt spectacula manè;—
Divisum imperium cum Jove Cæsar habet.'

VIRGIL.

All night the weeping tempests blow;
All day our state surpasseth shew;
Doubtless a blessed empire share
The Prince of Wales and Prince of Air."

* * * *

"An assembly met the other day at the Freemasons' Tavern to celebrate the Irish anniversary of Saint Patrick; and I shall proceed to extract from the *Morning Chronicle* such passages of what passed on the occasion as apply to his royal highness, in order that the reader may see at once what is now thought of him, not by Whigs and Pittites, or any other party of the state, but by the fondest and most trusting of his fellow-subjects—by those whose hearts have danced at his name, who have caught from it inspiration to their poetry, patience to their afflictions, and hope to their patriotism.

"The anniversary of this day—a day always precious in the estimation of an Irishman—was celebrated yesterday at the Freemasons' Tavern by a numerous and highly respectable assemblage of individuals. The Marquis of Lansdowne presided at the meeting, supported by the Marquis of Downshire, the Earl of Moira, Mr. Sheridan, the Lord Mayor, Mr. Sheriff Heygate, &c. &c. When the cloth was removed, *Non nobis Domine* was sung; after which the Marquis of Lansdowne, premising that the meeting was assembled for purposes of charity rather than of party or political feeling, gave 'the health of the King,' which was drunk with enthusiastic and rapturous applause. This was followed by 'God save the King;' and then the noble marquis gave 'the health of the Prince Regent,' which was drunk with partial applause and loud and reiterated hisses. The next toast, which called forth great and continued applause, lasting nearly five minutes, was 'the Navy and Army.'

"The interests of the charity were then considered; and, after a procession of the children (a sight worth all the gaudy and hollow flourish of military and courtly pomps), a very handsome collection

was made from the persons present. Upon this, the toasts were resumed; and 'Lord Moira's health being drunk with loud and reiterated cheering,' his lordship made a speech, in which *not a word was uttered of the Regent*. Here let the reader pause a moment, and consider what a quantity of meaning must be wrapped up in the silence of such a man with regard to his old companion and prince. Lord Moira universally bears the character of a man who is generous to a fault; he is even said to be almost unacquainted with the language of denial or rebuke; and if this part of his character has been injurious to him, it has at least, with his past and his present experience, helped him to a thorough knowledge of the prince's character. Yet this nobleman, so generous, so kindly affectioned, so well experienced, even he has nothing to say in favour of his old acquaintance. * * * *

"The healths of the vice-presidents were then given; and after a short speech from Lord Mountjoy, and much *anticipating* clamour with 'Mr. Sheridan's health,' Mr. Sheridan *at length* arose, and in a low tone of voice returned his thanks for the honourable notice by which so large a meeting of his countrymen thought proper to distinguish him. (*Applause.*) He had ever been proud of Ireland, and hoped that his country might never have cause to be ashamed of him. (*Applause.*) Ireland never forgot those who did all they could do, however little that might be, in behalf of her best interests. All allusion to politics had been industriously deprecated by their noble chairman. He was aware that charity was the immediate object of their meeting; but standing as he did before an assembly of his countrymen, he could not affect to disguise his conviction, that at the present crisis Ireland involved in itself every consideration dear to the best interests of the empire. (*Hear, hear.*) It was therefore that he was most anxious that nothing should transpire in that meeting calculated to injure those great objects, or to visit with undeserved censure the conduct of persons whose love to Ireland was as cordial and as zealous as it ever had been. He confessed frankly, that, knowing as he did the unaltered and unalterable sentiments of one *illustrious personage* towards Ireland, he could not conceal from the meeting that he had felt considerably shocked at the *sulky coldness* and *sultry discontent* with which they had on that evening drunk the health of the Prince Regent. (Here we are sorry to observe that Mr. S. was interrupted by *no very equivocal* symptoms of disapprobation.) When silence was somewhat restored, Mr. Sheridan said that he knew the Prince Regent well—(*hisses*)—he knew his *principles*—(*hisses*),—they would, at least he hoped, give him credit for believing that he knew them when he said he did. (*Applause.*) He repeated, that he knew well the principles of the Prince Regent; and that so well satisfied was he that they were all that Ireland could wish, that he (Mr. Sheridan) hoped, that as he had lived up to them, so he might die in the principles of the Prince Regent. (*Hisses and applause.*) He should be sorry personally to have merited their disapprobation.

(General applause, with cries of 'Change the subject, and speak out.') He could only assure them, that the Prince Regent remained unchangeably true to those principles. (*Here the clamours became so loud and general, that we could collect nothing more.*) * *

"It is impossible, however, before the present article is closed, to resist an observation or two on the saddest of these ministerial papers. Our readers are aware that the *Morning Post*, above all its rivals, has a faculty of carrying its nonsense to a pitch that becomes amusing in spite of itself, and affords relief to one's feelings in the very excess of its inflictions. Its paper of Thursday last, in answer to a real or pretended correspondent, contained the following paragraph: 'The publication of the article of a friend, relative to the ungenerous, unmanly conduct, displayed at a late public meeting, though evidently well meant, would only serve to give consequence to a set of worthless beings, whose imbecile efforts are best treated with sovereign contempt.' *Worthless beings and sovereign contempt!* * * * *

"Help us, benevolent compositers, to some mark or other, some significant and comprehensive index, that shall denote a laugh of an hour's duration. If any one of our readers should not be so well acquainted as another with the taste and principles of this bewitching *Post*, he may be curious to see what notions of praise and political justice are entertained by the persons whose contempt is so overwhelming.

"He shall have a specimen; and when he is reading it, let him lament, in the midst of his laughter, that a paper capable of such sickening adulation should have the power of finding its way to the table of an English prince, and of helping to endanger the country by polluting the sources of its government. The same page which contained the specimen of contempt above mentioned, contained also a set of wretched commonplace lines in French, Italian, Spanish, and English, *literally* addressing the Prince Regent in the following terms, among others: 'You are the *glory of the people*'—'You are the *protector of the arts*'—'You are the *Mecænas of the age*'—'Wherever you appear, *you conquer all hearts*, wipe away tears, excite *desire and love*, and win *beauty* towards you'—'You breathe *eloquence*'—'You inspire the *graces*'—'You are *Adonis in loveliness*!' 'Thus gifted,' it proceeds in English,—

'Thus gifted with each grace of mind,
Born to delight and bless mankind,
Wisdom, with Pleasure in her train,
Great prince! shall signalise thy reign:
To Honour, Virtue, Truth allied;
The nation's safeguard and its pride;
With monarchs of immortal fame
Shall bright renown enrol thy name.'

"What person unacquainted with the true state of the case would imagine, in reading these astounding eulogies, that this '*glory of*

the people' was the subject of millions of shrugs and reproaches!—that this '*protector of the arts*' had named a wretched foreigner his historical painter, in disparagement or in ignorance of the merits of his own countrymen!—that this '*Mecænas of the age*' patronised not a single deserving writer!—that this '*breather of eloquence*' could not say a few decent extempore words; if we are to judge, at least, from what he said to his regiment on its embarkation for Portugal!—that this '*conqueror of hearts*' was the disappointor of hopes!—that this '*exciter of desire*' [bravo! Messieurs of the *Post*!], this '*Adonis in loveliness*,' was a corpulent man of fifty!—in short, that this *delightful, blissful, wise, pleasurable, honourable, virtuous, true, and immortal* prince, was a violator of his word, a libertine over head and ears in disgrace, a despiser of domestic ties, the companion of gamblers and demireps, a man who has just closed half a century without one single claim on the gratitude of his country or the respect of posterity!

"These are hard truths; but are they *not* truths? And have we not suffered enough—are we not now suffering bitterly—from the disgusting flatteries of which the above is a repetition? The ministers may talk of the shocking boldness of the press, and may throw out their wretched warnings about interviews between Mr. Perceval and Sir Vicary Gibbs; but let us inform them, that such vices as have just been enumerated are shocking to all Englishmen who have a just sense of the state of Europe; and that he is a bolder man who, in times like the present, dares to afford reason for the description. Would to God the *Examiner* could ascertain that difficult, and perhaps undiscoverable, point which enables a public writer to keep clear of an appearance of the love of scandal, while he is hunting out the vices of those in power! Then should one paper, at least, in this metropolis help to rescue the nation from the charge of silently encouraging what it must publicly rue; and the Sardapalus who is now afraid of none but informers be taught to shake, in the midst of his minions, in the very drunkenness of his heart, at the voice of honesty. But if this be impossible, still there is one benefit which truth may derive from adulation—one benefit which is favourable to the former in proportion to the grossness of the latter, and of which none of his flatterers seem to be aware—the opportunity of contradicting its assertions. Let us never forget this advantage, which adulation cannot help giving us; and let such of our readers as are inclined to deal insincerely with the great from a false notion of policy and of knowledge of the world, take warning from what we now see of the miserable effects of courtly disguise, paltering, and profligacy. Flattery in any shape is unworthy a man and a gentleman; but political flattery is almost a request to be made slaves. If we would have the great to be what they ought, we must find some means or other to speak of them as they are."

Such was the political writing which in the year 1812 was visited with heavy fine and imprisonment. Mr. Hunt conjec-

tures—probably truly enough—that it was the laugh at the “corpulent man of fifty” which gave the sting to the arrow. After sentence was passed, the brothers were given to understand, “through the medium of a third person, but in a manner emphatically serious and potential,” that if they would let the Prince alone for the future, they should not go to prison. On their going to prison, the same offer was repeated, so far as the fine was concerned. They refused both offers. In gaol Mr. Leigh Hunt was treated leniently, and found himself tolerably comfortable; and good care he takes to tell us how “cheerful” he made every thing become. When he was again free, he cultivated his friendship with Byron, Shelley, and others of the same school. By and by, the profits of the *Examiner* began to diminish, and Mr. Hunt went to Italy, where, with Lord Byron, he helped in the burning of Shelley’s body, after the true Pagan fashion. After this he quarrelled with Byron; but the quarrel, as all the incidents in his life, he rather alludes to than relates. Then follows a lengthy account of Mr. Hunt’s visits to a few parts of Italy; and the remainder of the book gives a brief history of his literary life until the present time, interspersed with an abundance of irrelevant matter. The volumes contain also a few unpublished letters from Byron, Moore, and Shelley, for the most part sufficiently uninteresting. May every book that advocates the same principles be found equally dull and uninviting!

QUEEN MARY.

The Clifton Tracts. Queen Mary and her People. No. 2.
The Smithfield Fires. Burns and Lambert.

IF we wished to choose a specially striking instance of contradiction between men’s words and actions, we should probably single out the popular professions respecting religious toleration. A man who openly and honestly says, in this present day of hypocrisies, “I am a persecutor; in such and such case I would imprison or exile persons for their religious opinions,”—such a man is a rarity of the scarcest sort. “Persecution,” the world says, “is contrary to the spirit of the meek and mild religion of the Saviour; it is barbarous; it is irrational; it is bloodthirsty; above all, it is Popish.” Yet, from Greenland to Cape Horn, from the Rocky Moun-

tains to the Celestial Empire, we do not believe that a single human being is to be found who, in some circumstances or other, would not punish his fellow-creatures because of their religion. They who profess the principles of universal toleration are like the sage philosopher who protested that it is nothing more than the force of habit which makes us cry "Oh!" when we are hurt. He himself, he asseverated, had completely cured himself of the foolish trick, and whenever *he* was hurt, cried out "Q! Q!" giving himself at the same time two or three smartish raps on the arm, and loudly ejaculating "Q! Q!" Whereupon a stander-by quietly walked round our philosopher, and hitting him suddenly on the back of his head, elicited an instantaneous "Oh!" which put to flight all his previous crotchets, and vindicated the claims of the natural cry of mankind.

Just such are these advocates of universal toleration. "Persecution is the vice of uncivilised ages; in the nineteenth century we are cured of it; it is the glory of an Englishman to tolerate Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Papists; England is the land of civil and religious liberty." Thus they talk, glorifying themselves with illustrations of their liberality of their own choosing or inventing; when suddenly the words, "The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster" greets their eyes; and in an instant the lamb is transformed into the lion—the *British* lion, of course—and the land resounds with cries for the instant persecution of those who dare to worship according to the religion of the Pope of Rome.

And such has *ever* been the conduct of our fellow-countrymen, long before an Archbishop of Westminster was heard of. How long is it since Catholics have been tolerated in Parliament? How many of the old penal laws are still unrepealed? How many "tolerant" Englishmen are there who would hire a Catholic cook or housemaid? How many ultra-liberal fathers and mothers who would not visit the conversion of their children to Catholicism by an alteration in their wills? How many politicians who would not put every possible civil obstacle in the way of the public preaching of Monks and Jesuits? How many merchants who, if they had to choose a Mahometan or a Catholic for a clerk, would not prefer the Mahometan? They are all alike; they have no faith in toleration; in practice they find it contrary to the laws of common sense, and push its suggestions aside as the dreams of an unreal sentimentalism. At this very moment the laws in Protestant countries against Catholicism are every whit as severe as those in Catholic countries against Protestantism. In Denmark, for instance, there are only five places in the whole

kingdom where the Catholic worship is tolerated at all. A Russian subject cannot, we believe, become a Catholic without forfeiting every thing that he possesses.

And as the most ultra-tolerant of talkers have no true belief in their own professions, so they never give Catholics credit for sincerity when *they* fall in with the fashionable phraseology of the day, and protest that they would tolerate every man's creed to the fullest extent. Certainly they are marvellously astonished to hear these novel views proceeding from the mouths of the children of those who slew the Calvinists in Holland and the Albigenses in France, and filled Smithfield with fagots and flames. Wonderful, indeed, they say, must be the advance in civilisation, and blessed the influence of English Protestantism, when even a Papist can preach tolerance, and embrace in fraternal charity a Socinian and a Jew. But as for believing that such a Papist is thoroughly *sincere*—as for giving him credit for being *neither* a questionable Catholic nor a cunning deceiver—that is far enough from their thoughts. Never do we fall into a more grievous error than when we think to conciliate Protestants by donning a pseudo-Protestant mask. A more suicidal policy was never devised than that which is adopted by that strange *lusus naturæ*, a “liberal Catholic.” The acuteness of the Protestant mind comes instantly into full play and detects the sham. At fault when it would probe its own hollownesses, and far from suspecting itself of being a more violent persecutor than Catholicism, it smiles at *our* efforts at compromise with heresy, and only believes us sincere by imputing to us a secret disaffection to our real creed.

Counting, then, the concealment of our true opinions as the most unwise of policies, we have ever avowed our conviction that in certain circumstances what is called “persecution” is both lawful and expedient. We regard it as equally repugnant to reason and revelation to suppose that those who are the depositaries of civil power and civil influence should not exercise this power and this influence in such a manner as to promote *all* the best interests of mankind, both temporal and eternal. Believing that secular government and the framework of society are the appointment of almighty God, and not the invention of the devil, we cannot conceive how it can be other than the *duty* of government and of society to uphold that other and better work of the same almighty God, namely, the religion which He has given to save men's souls. The sole question that remains is, how *best* to serve the interests of religion; that is, whether by absolute toleration of all error, or by a careful adaptation of temporal punishments to the circum-

stances of each individual case of heresy. Of course, persecution must be directed against that which *is* heresy. To persecute Catholicism is to sin against almighty God; to persecute Protestantism, or Judaism, or infidelity, is perfectly right, provided only it be so judiciously planned and executed as not to defeat its own ends. Persecution is not a good thing absolutely; and irrespective of its results, it may be a frightful evil. In an immense number of cases we conceive that the persecution of heretics has been in the highest degree inexpedient; and if we were compelled to choose between the universal persecution or the universal toleration of Protestants, in all probability we should choose the latter. The course of history, as well as natural common sense, shews that in many cases the absolute toleration of error is the surest means for preventing its propagation, and that in almost all cases the most lenient forms of persecution have proved more efficacious than the more severe.

Any thing less than the extermination of its teachers, whether by banishment, imprisonment, or death, rarely, *if ever*, succeeds; while extermination, except where its adherents are very few in number, is manifestly impossible, and while the appearance of *needless* severity creates a sympathy for the sufferers which would never be awakened by mere measures of repression, as gentle as the circumstances would possibly admit.

Little, moreover, as Protestants suppose it, it is an undeniable fact, that the Holy See itself has been ever the most earnest of opponents of excessive severity in the persecution of heretics. The English world, so far as it troubles itself to discriminate in such matters at all, imagines that the surest way to stay the persecuting spirit of Catholics is to detach them as far as possible from the Pope, and to nationalise them in their faith as well as in their politics. Yet, as certainly as that Great Britain is an island, the bloody persecutions of heresy, one and all, owe their severity to this very national and anti-Papal tendency in their originators and perpetrators. Again and again has the Pope interfered in behalf of the sufferer, again and again has all violence been opposed by ultramontane Catholics, and again and again have these persecutions been made doubly sanguinary with the sole view of strengthening the power of the temporal government, to the manifest contempt and injury of the rights of the Holy See and the Episcopate. The records of the Inquisition in *Spain* furnish some of the most striking proofs of the abhorrence entertained by the Holy See of all needless severity; as the very last attacks made upon the Inquisition in *Rome* shew

that if the Holy Office has erred at all when under the immediate shadow of the Vatican, it has erred on the side of excessive leniency.

But we need not go to Spain for proofs of the cruelty of nationalised Catholicism, or to Rome for proofs of the gentleness of Ultramontaniam. England itself supplies its pregnant testimony to the folly of those politicians who think to rob Rome of her severities by Gallicanising her children, and bribing them to think more of the Queen than of the Pope. That "reign of terror," the bugbear of Protestant boyhood, and the last resource of Exeter Hall,—the reign of "Bloody Mary,"—is itself a sufficient proof that it is not Ultramontaniam, but Nationalism, which delights in the shedding of heretical blood, and which is afraid to tolerate the existence of a Protestant preacher. There stand the facts, clear and irrefragable. It is not the Pope, it is not the Cardinal, it is not the Spanish friar, who lights the Smithfield fires as the only means of putting a stop to the deadly poison of Calvin and Cranmer. It is that wretched, worldly, king-serving party, the anti-Papal Catholics, as they were termed, who became Protestants under Henry and Edward, and then Catholics again under Mary, who, having got possession of the executive of the kingdom, force upon the queen their bloody executions, and make the burning of heretics the instrument for consolidating their own power. So it is, and so certain Protestant historians have from time to time confessed it. Unhappily, the popular compilations of English history from which our fellow-countrymen and fellow-countrywomen learn their modicum of knowledge of the past, are as false on this point as on every other in which religion is concerned; and it has been no easy matter to put into their hands any statement of the real truth sufficiently brief to ensure their attention. For the sum of three-halfpence, however, any person who wishes to satisfy himself or others as to the actual causes of the burnings under Queen Mary may now be gratified. Of the many excellent tracts already published in the Clifton Series, edited by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Northcote, none, we think, are more to the purpose or more useful, than the two tracts called *Queen Mary and her People*. The second of the two especially handles the question of the Smithfield fires in a manner which must open the eyes of every person who has hitherto looked back to the days of "Bloody Mary" with either horror or regret. Though written in the most straightforward and unpretending style, the matter and manner are so good that few of our readers, even the best-instructed, will regret the quarter of an hour necessary for reading the tract.

A few paragraphs will shew the manner in which the subject is treated.

First, as to the provocations given by the Protestants, and the consequent impossibility of avoiding *all* severity :

“ A clerk of the council in the former reign, and one of Wyatt’s followers, conspired to assassinate the Queen, and was found guilty and executed. On the scaffold he justified his treason, and said he died for his country. An impostor was suborned to personate Edward VI., as if he were not really dead. On occasion of public prayers being ordered for the Queen, several of the reformed congregations prayed for her death. So notorious was this practice, that an act had been passed declaring it to be treason ; and so little did the leaders of the Reformation feel its enormity, that when thirty of these zealots, with their preacher, were imprisoned for the offence, Bishop Hooper sent a letter to comfort them, as suffering saints. Again, one of the Queen’s preachers was shot at in the pulpit at Paul’s Cross, the bullet passing very near him ; and two of her chaplains were insulted and pelted with stones as they walked in the streets. Aspersions of the foulest nature were thrown upon the Queen’s character, and the most false and malicious tales put in circulation in order to poison the minds of the people against her. Even ‘ pious frauds’ were resorted to by the disaffected. One of their contrivances was as follows. Extraordinary sounds were heard to issue from the wall of an uninhabited house in Aldersgate Street, which were interpreted to the crowd by persons who seemed to be there by accident like the rest. Several thousands of persons assembled. Some said it was an angel, a voice from heaven, the voice of the Holy Ghost warning a wicked and unbelieving generation. When the crowd shouted, ‘ God save Queen Mary!’ it answered nothing. When they cried, ‘ God save the Lady Elizabeth!’ it answered, ‘ So be it.’ If they asked, ‘ What is the Mass?’ it answered, ‘ Idolatry.’ It also spoke against confession and other Catholic practices ; and threatened the people with war, famine, pestilence, and earthquake. Every day the tumult increased ; at last workmen were sent by the magistrates to demolish the wall, when a young girl crept out of her hiding-place, and confessed that she had been hired and instructed to act her part by some of the reformed, for the purpose of exciting an outbreak.

“ Another very important fact must also be mentioned. The Protestant party in England were in communication with a Protestant faction in France, and were encouraged by the Catholic king and government of that country, who disliked the Spanish match, because they feared that England would unite with the Emperor of Germany against France. The French ambassador in England, contrary to all the laws commonly observed between nations, and all the principles of good faith, entered into a secret correspondence with the Protestant leaders, and with the discontented whoever they might be. He admitted them to midnight conferences in his own

house, and urged them to take up arms against the Queen, promising them at the same time aid from France. The French king (Henry II.) sanctioned these intrigues, and sent money for the relief of the more needy among the conspirators; he opened an asylum for the English rebels, and ordered the governors of his ports and the officers of his navy to furnish them with all the aid they conveniently could without discovery; nor to the last did he cease corresponding with the factious and fomenting rebellion. All this was known to Mary and her advisers; and it is needless to inquire what effect it had upon them. In punishing these secret plotters, they could hardly feel that they were persecuting pure lovers of the gospel, especially as their patron was a Catholic prince."

Next, as to the share taken by the Pope, the Legate, and the Bishops, in promoting the sanguinary character of the punishment of heretics:

"Now, then, comes the question, Who was it—or who were they—who advised and originated these sanguinary proceedings? Was it the Catholic Church—the Pope, the Pope's Legate, and the Bishops? Let Protestant historians give the answer. And first of Cardinal Pole, the Papal Legate, Bishop Burnet writes, that 'he never set on the clergy to persecute heretics, but to reform themselves;' and that from the first 'he professed himself the enemy of extreme proceedings.' He said that 'pastors ought to have bowels even to their straying sheep; Bishops were fathers, and ought to look on those that erred as their sick children, and not for that to kill them; he had seen too that severe proceedings did rather inflame than cure that disease.' 'There was a great difference,' he urged, 'to be made between a nation uninfected, where some few teachers came to spread errors, and a nation that had been overrun with them, both clergy and laity.' Another writes, that 'he advised that they should rest themselves satisfied with the restitution of their own religion; that the statutes against heresy should be held forth for a terror only; but that no open prosecution should be raised' against the Protestants. 'That it was not to be expected people would be *dragged* out of their errors all at once, but that they ought to be *led* back by degrees.' And from the moment he became Archbishop of Canterbury (which he did at Cranmer's death) all severities were put a stop to in his diocese; the only executions that took place being ordered while he lay upon his death-bed, and probably, therefore, without his knowing even the fact of their occurrence. At all events, then, it is plain that the Legate had no instructions from the Pope to urge the government to acts of violence; and this alone ought to convince any reasonable person that Catholics are not bound by the very principles of their religion, as their adversaries falsely say, to exterminate the enemies of the faith. Bishop Gardiner, again, is generally charged by Protestants with being foremost in recommending the shedding of blood; but certainly without sufficient evidence. The only occasion on which he took any part what-

ever in the execution of the law was that on which, by virtue of his office as chancellor, he declared certain persons to be on their own confession heretics, and by such declaration delivered them as prisoners to the civil power. After the execution of these men he never again appears upon the scene; and a Protestant writer says, that there is every reason to believe that 'he disapproved such sanguinary intolerance.' Even those who are most loud in their accusations against him, allow that he was for 'taking away only the principal supporters of the heretics, and some of the more pragmatic preachers,' and for 'sparing the rest;' which shews that he was no advocate for wholesale persecution. And one thing at least is certain, that in his own diocese not a single execution for heresy took place.

"But more than this: a most earnest endeavour was made to stay such proceedings altogether. Five or six persons from the humblest classes being condemned to die, Alphonsus di Castro, a Spanish friar, and confessor to King Philip, in a sermon which he preached before him, boldly denounced the measures taken against the Protestants as contrary to the spirit of the gospel, and bade the Bishops look to the office with which Christ had entrusted them. Hereupon 'the Bishops openly declared against these sanguinary methods,' and a stop was put to any further severities; the council also seemed disposed to relent, when unhappily the outrage in St. Margaret's Church occurred, to which I have alluded; other fanatical excesses were committed; and, what had the worst effect of all, a conspiracy of a formidable character was detected, which had for its object the overthrowing of the government. This turned the scale against the prisoners, and the fires were again kindled. Nor must you suppose that the Bishops generally were forward in promoting the wishes of the government. The contrary is the fact. Many instances are recorded by Protestant writers of their having exercised mercy even with danger to themselves. Often they declined the odious task of proceeding against those who were brought before them, sometimes refusing to receive the prisoners, at others suffering the charges to lie over until they were forgotten. 'The Bishops,' says a Protestant writer, 'eagerly availed themselves of any subterfuge by which they could escape pronouncing these revolting sentences.' Nor was it, in fact, until the council addressed a circular letter of admonition, or rather of rebuke, to the whole Episcopate, for their want of zeal in the cause of religion and the country's peace, that they took the matter seriously in hand. This letter thus far completely clears the Bishops. It charges them with refusing to receive 'the disordered persons' who had been brought before them, or if they received them, with not 'proceeding against them according to the order of justice, but rather suffering them to continue in their errors.'

"On the whole, then, it is most certain that the clergy shrunk from the odious office which the state imposed upon them; that they always inclined to the side of mercy, and even incurred the displea-

sure of the civil power in their desire to screen the unhappy offenders. 'Of fourteen bishoprics,' says a Protestant historian, 'the Catholic prelates used their influence so successfully as altogether to prevent bloodshed in nine, and to reduce it within limits in the remaining five.' And this is true even of Bishop Bonner, that 'bloody wolf,' as Fox called him. Dr. Maitland has shewn that he has been falsely charged with cruelty, or undue harshness in the discharge of his unwelcome office; that, on the contrary, he treated the accused with remarkable lenity and forbearance, often remanding the prisoners in order to give them time for reflection, thus inducing many to recant, and taking care to proceed only by due course of law. He did not make the law, and would gladly not have acted upon it; but when those whose duty it was to maintain order in the state assured him, as they did all the Bishops, that it was impossible to preserve the public peace unless the law was put in force, it must at least be allowed that his position was a difficult and a responsible one. And this, then, is all for which I would contend. The Church did not originate or advise these measures. It was not the Church, the Papal Legate, or the Bishops, or the priests, who urged on the government against the Protestants; but it was the government which urged the Bishops to carry out the law, and that on the ground that Protestant opinions were made the cloak for every manner of disorder and impiety. Persons were brought into the Bishops' courts accused of heresy and sacrilege; and the Bishops simply heard the charges, and judged according to the evidence. Heresy and sacrilege were, as a matter of fact, punishable by law; and they could no more refuse to try such cases, when formally brought before them,—the government at the same time insisting on the prosecution,—than the judges of the land at the present day could refuse to try persons accused of sedition, rioting, or other misdemeanours."

Again, on the Queen's own share in the work :

"I am not denying that Mary gave a general consent to the infliction of capital punishment; but it was to be done with moderation and discretion. Upon her council advising extreme measures, she said she would have them act 'without rashness;' and though she put in no plea for such as by learning might 'deceive the simple,' she desired that the rest should be 'so used that the people might well perceive them not to be condemned without just occasion.' At any rate, no blood-thirstiness of spirit is here displayed; and remember the provocation she had received, and the grounds she had for thinking that mercy was thrown away on those with whom she had to do. She herself had met with neither pity nor common courtesy from the Reformers while they were in power; the privacy of her family worship had been invaded, and her household persecuted; she had been insulted by one of the Protestant Bishops in her palace; and owed her life more to the protection of her kinsman, Charles V., and the fear of her enemies, than to their

sense of justice. She had seen the Catholic Bishops confined for years in dungeons; the ancient faith proscribed; attendance at the new service enforced by every penalty short of death; the will of her father, although secured by oath, violated in her despite; the succession changed because she was a Catholic; an armed force resisting her lawful rights; insurrections threatening her throne from the same party; her religion outraged and insulted. All this should be remembered before we condemn her for listening to her counsellors; but still, in point of fact, what part did she take in the Smithfield fires? Her biographer declares that all the time they lasted, she was 'a prey to the severest headaches, her head being frightfully swelled; she was likewise subject to perpetual attacks of hysteria, which other women exhale by tears or piercing cries (thus, by the way, implying her extraordinary self-command). Who can believe that a woman in this state of mortal suffering was capable of governing a kingdom, or that she was accountable for any thing done in it?' Fox confirms this view: 'sometimes,' he reports, 'she lay weeks without speaking, as one dead; and more than once the rumour went that she had died in child-bed.' 'For a few afternoons, at times, the Queen struggled to pay the attention to business she had formerly done; but her health gave way in the attempt, and she was seen no more at council.' And afterwards, the writer shews that on particular occasions (she mentions expressly that of Cranmer's execution) the Queen was not present at the council, and that her signature was wanting to warrants of arrest. Finally, let me quote you the opinion of a Protestant historian, 'who lived too near the time to be deceived:' 'She had been a worthy princess,' he says, 'if as little cruelty had been done under her as by her. She hated to equivocate, and always was what she was, without dissembling her judgment or conduct for fear or flattery.'

Lastly, as to the real character of the men who held the reins of government under Mary:

"These men" (who had almost all of them turned Protestants in Edward's reign) "were now in power; and though they had consented to acknowledge the Pope's supremacy, they had not done so in a spirit of faith, or of attachment to the Holy See. They were men of no principle, or at least of low principle. They preferred being Catholics as a matter of taste and conviction; but before all things they were men of the world. They were political Catholics, national Catholics. They acted, if not wholly yet principally, from worldly motives. They followed the suggestions of human policy and prudence. These were the men who, under provocation, kindled the fires of Smithfield; and thus brought reproach upon the religion they professed, and the Queen whom they pretended to serve. They had none of that gentle, loving, forbearing temper, which is so peculiarly the mind of Christ. They thought to carry things with a high hand, and to put down opposition to the truth with carnal weapons; that is to say, by the mere force of the temporal power. But

be this as it may, I assert, without fear of contradiction, that Mary's government was not in spirit and in truth a Catholic government. *It was composed of anti-Papal Catholics.* And this is no invention of mine to serve a purpose. The Protestant biographer of Mary, whom I have before quoted, declares the same; and I beg you to mark her words: 'The principal calamities of Mary's life had been inflicted by the anti-Papal Catholics, who were at this era greatly superior in numbers and political power to either of the others (Protestants or Papal Catholics). From their ranks had been drawn the rigorous ministry that aided Henry VIII. in his long course of despotic cruelty, his rapacity, his bigamies, and his religious persecutions. The survivors of this junta were now the ministers of Queen Mary.' It was they who 'oppressed the people, defied the laws, bullied or corrupted the judges, cajoled and really controlled the crown.' And again, speaking of the parliaments 'which legalised these acts of cruelty: 'Shall we call the House of Lords *bigoted*, when its majority consisted of the same individuals who had planted very recently the Protestant Church of England? Surely not; for the term implies honest though wrong-headed attachment to *one* religion. . . . The majority of the persons composing the Houses of Peers and Commons were dishonest, indifferent to all religions, and willing to establish the most opposing rituals, so that they might retain their grasp on the accursed thing with which their very souls were corrupted. The Church lands, with which Henry VIII. had bribed his aristocracy, titled and untitled, into co-operation with his enormities, both personal and political, had induced national depravity. . . . Yet all ought not to be included in one sweeping censure; a noble minority of good men, disgusted at the detestable penal laws which lighted the torturing fires for the Protestants, seceded bodily from the House of Commons, after vainly opposing them. This glorious band was composed of Catholics as well as Protestants; it was headed by the great legalist, Sergeant Plowden, a Catholic so firm, as to refuse the chancellorship, when urged to take it by Queen Elizabeth, because he would not change his religion.'"

WRIGHT'S NARRATIVES OF SORCERY AND MAGIC.

Narratives of Sorcery and Magic, from the most Authentic Sources. By Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., &c. Bentley.

A SATISFACTORY treatise on sorcery and magic can no more be expected from a person who does not believe in the devil, than a satisfactory treatise on theology from a person who does not believe in God. The author of these two volumes is one

of the ordinary class of Protestants of the present day, who really believe in just what they see, and nothing more. Probably, if asked any such unphilosophical question as, "Do you believe that there is such a being as the devil?" Mr. Wright would hesitate as to expressing his total disbelief in any thing so strange to the deductions of modern science and modern book-making. Nevertheless, he has about as much belief in the existence of the nine Muses as in the practical interference of Satan in the affairs of men. The Bible, it is true,—that unlucky book for Protestant philosophisers,—speaks of satanic possessions, witches, devils, and so forth, as realities; but "no doubt these are all mythical accommodations to the superstitions of the Jews," says the school to which Mr. Wright belongs. "*Nous avons changé tout cela*; the very idea of any personal intercourse between man and Satan is absurd. Sorcery and witchcraft are simply subjects for literary investigation, in company with other old-world delusions; Satan himself has long ago disappeared, in company with the phoenix, and the men who carried their heads below their shoulders. The farce of exorcism is still only kept up by the Papists, in order to foster in the ignorant a belief in sacerdotal power."

These ideas, indeed, are not put out by Mr. Wright in any philosophic or carefully-elaborated form. His book is little more than a mere collection of stories of witches and sorcerers, strung together with flimsy links of observation and reflection. Still, his scepticism in the invisible world is quite undisguised, and his hatred of Catholicism is of the true vulgar *littérateur* stamp. His book has also another great demerit. He prints on his title-page that his "narratives" are "from the most authentic sources;" but he has not bestowed on the reader the slightest information as to the authenticity of each "narrative" itself. He has merely jumbled together a heap of tales, in a sort of chronological order; some historically true; others glaringly false, though professedly true; others mere popular legends; and others verging on the professedly fictitious. The whole is a sheer piece of book-making, just suited to the atmosphere of book-clubs and circulating libraries; but as a contribution to the literature of the subject very nearly worthless. "From the most authentic sources" means just that Mr. Wright has not falsified the originals from which he has copied his stories, and nothing more.

Many of the tales themselves, taken simply as illustrations of a past state of society, or as episodes in the history of religious error, are curious enough. Mr. Wright would have us believe, as he tells us in his preface, that they serve to shew how "the paganism of our forefathers, instead of being

eradicated by Papal Rome, was preserved as a useful instrument of power, and fostered until it grew into a monster far more fearful and degrading than the original from which it sprang, and infinitely more cruel in its influence." The discriminating reader, however, will deduce even from Mr. Wright's pages a judgment the very reverse of this, and will see how incessantly the Church has laboured to put an end to every thing like a pampering of the superstitions of the vulgar, while the *secular* great and wealthy have been the chief employers of unholy things for the purpose of accomplishing their abominable ends. In actual fact, further, Protestantism, since it has existed, has had quite as much to do with sorcery and witchcraft as Catholicism. No mediæval agitations were more exaggerated or cruel than those which have seized upon the Calvinistic inhabitants of New England and of Scotland, and upon the sober race which glories in the name of Anglo-Saxon. To assert that "Papal Rome" employed the old superstitions for her own ambitious purposes, is purely ridiculous. You might as well allege that the English Catholic clergy of the present day were given to cherishing superstitions, and inventing sham miracles, for the purpose of enthralling the intellects of the laity. We have little doubt that in old times, as now, the priesthood was the great discourager of credulity; and that easy as it might have been to cheat a priest in matters of *this* world, it was hard enough to get him to lend his countenance to any tale claiming to be supernatural. Mr. Wright would probably have his own explanation for this fact: he would say that priests being all rogues themselves, were naturally suspicious of roguery in others; as a thief looks upon all mankind as burglars or pickpockets. We, on the contrary, who judge the priesthood by facts and by personal knowledge, and knowing that craft and roguery are the very last of sins to be attributed to them, recognise in their habitual cautiousness of belief the working of that spirit of prudence which dwells in the Catholic Church, and makes her as slow to believe without proof, as she is ready to believe with proof.

One of the most singular of the "narratives" is the story of Doctor Torralva,

"A physician in the family of the Admiral of Castile. Torralva was born at Cuença, but at the age of fifteen he was sent to Rome, where he became attached to the Bishop of Volterra, Francesco Soderini, in the quality of a page. He now pursued with great earnestness the study of philosophy and medicine under Dom Cipion and the masters Mariana, Avanselo, and Maguera, until he obtained the degree of doctor in medicine. Under these teachers, Torralva learnt to have doubts of the immortality of the soul and the divinity of

Christ, and made great advances in scepticism. About the year 1501, when he was already a practitioner in medicine at Rome, he formed a very intimate acquaintance with one master Alfonso, a man who had first quitted the Jewish faith for Mahomedanism, from which he had been converted to Christianity, and he had then finally adopted natural religion, or deism. This man's discourses overthrew the little faith that still remained in Torralva's mind, and he became a confirmed sceptic; although he appears to have concealed his opinions from the world, and perhaps he subsequently renounced them.

"Among Torralva's friends at Rome was a Dominican monk, called brother Pietro, who told him one day that he had in his service 'an angel of the order of good spirits,' named Zequiël, who was so powerful in the knowledge of the future and of hidden things, that he was without his equal in the spiritual world; and of such a peculiar temper that, while other spirits made bargains with their employers before they would give them their services, Zequiël was so disinterested that he despised all considerations of this kind, and served only in friendship those who placed their confidence in him and deserved his attachment. The least attempt at restraint, brother Pietro said, would drive him away for ever.

"Torralva's curiosity was excited; and when brother Pietro generously proposed to resign the familiar spirit to his friend, the offer was eagerly accepted. It appears that the person most concerned in this transaction made no objection to the change of masters, and at the summons of brother Pietro, Zequiël made his appearance, in the form of a fair young man, with light hair, and dressed in a flesh-coloured habit and black surtout. He addressed himself to Torralva, and said: 'I will be yours as long as you live, and will follow you wherever you are obliged to go.' From this time Zequiël appeared to Torralva at every change of the moon, and as often as the physician wanted his services, which was generally for the purpose of transporting him in a short space of time to distant places. In these interviews the spirit took sometimes the semblance of a traveller, and sometimes that of a hermit. In his intercourse with Torralva, he said nothing contrary to Christianity, but accompanied him to church, and never counselled him to evil; from which circumstances the physician concluded that his familiar was a good angel. He always conversed in the Latin or Italian languages.

"Rome had now become to Torralva a second country; but about the year 1502 he went to Spain, and subsequently he travelled through most parts of Italy, until he again fixed himself at Rome, under the protection of his old patron the Bishop of Volterra, who had been made a cardinal on the 31st of May, 1503. With this introduction he soon obtained the favour of others of the cardinals, and rose to high repute for his skill in medicine. Having met at this time with some books on chiromancy, he became an eager student in that art, in the knowledge of which he subsequently surpassed most of his contemporaries. Torralva owed his medical knowledge partly

to his familiar, who taught him the secret virtues of many plants, with which other physicians were not acquainted; and when the practitioner took exorbitant fees, Zequiél rebuked him, telling him that, since he had received his knowledge for nothing, he ought to impart it gratuitously. And when on several occasions Torralva was in want of money, he found a supply in his chamber, which he believed was furnished him by the good spirit, who, however, would never acknowledge that he was the secret benefactor who had relieved him from his embarrassment.

“Torralva returned to Spain in 1510, and lived for some time at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic. One day Zequiél, whose informations were usually of a political character, told him that the king would soon receive disagreeable news. Torralva immediately communicated this piece of information to Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop of Toledo (who was subsequently raised to the dignity of Cardinal, and made Inquisitor-general of Spain), and the grand captain Gonzalo Fernandez de Cordova. The same day a courier arrived with despatches from Africa, containing intelligence of the ill success of the expedition against the Moors, and of the death of Don Garcia de Toledo, son of the Duke of Alva, who commanded it.

“Torralva seems to have made no secret of his intercourse with Zequiél. He had received his familiar from a monk, and the spirit is said to have shewn himself to the Cardinal of Volterra at the physician's wish; the latter now did not hesitate to acquaint the Archbishop of Toledo and the grand captain how he came by his early intelligence. The archbishop earnestly desired to be permitted to have the same privilege as the Italian cardinal, and Torralva wished to gratify him, but Zequiél refused; though he softened his refusal by telling him to inform the archbishop that he would one day be a king, a prophecy which was believed to be fulfilled when he was made absolute governor of Spain and the Indies. * * *

“It was not long before he again returned to Spain, where, about the year 1516, the Cardinal of Santa Cruz, Don Bernardino de Carbajal, consulted him on a subject of some importance. A Spanish lady named Rosales had complained to Don Bernardino that her nights were disturbed by a phantom which appeared in the form of a murdered man. The cardinal had sent his physician, Dr. Morales, who watched at night with the lady, but saw no apparition, although she gave him notice of its appearance, and pointed out the place where it stood. Don Bernardino hoped to know more of the matter by the means of Torralva, and he requested him to go with the physician Morales to pass the night in the lady's house. They went together, and an hour after midnight they heard the lady's cry of alarm, and went into her room, where, as before, Morales saw nothing. But Torralva, who was better acquainted with the spiritual world, perceived a figure resembling a dead man, behind which appeared another apparition in the form of a woman. He asked with a firm voice, ‘What dost thou seek here?’ to which the apparition replied, ‘A treasure,’ and immediately disappeared. Tor-

ralva consulted Zequiél on this subject, and was informed that there was buried under the house the corpse of a man who had been stabbed to death with a poniard. * * *

"In 1520, Torralva went again to Rome. Being at Valladolid, he told Diego de Zuñiga of his intentions, informing him that he had the means of travelling there with extraordinary rapidity; that he had but to place himself astride on a stick, and he was carried through the air, guided by a cloud of fire. On his arrival at Rome, he saw the Cardinal of Volterra and the grand prior of the order of St. John, who were very earnest with him that he should give them his familiar spirit. Torralva entreated Zequiél to comply with their wish, but in vain. In 1525, Zequiél recommended him to return to Spain, assuring him that he would obtain the place of physician to the Infanta Eleanor, queen dowager of Portugal, and subsequently consort of François I. of France. Torralva obeyed the suggestion of his monitor, and obtained the promised appointment.

"It was after his return to Spain, and before he obtained this appointment, that a circumstance occurred which added greatly to Torralva's celebrity. On the evening of the 5th of May, of the year last mentioned (1525), the physician received a visit from Zequiél, who told him that Rome would be taken next day by the troops of the emperor, and Torralva desired to be taken to Rome to see this important event. They left Valladolid together at eleven o'clock at night on foot, as if to take a walk; but at a short distance from the town Zequiél gave his companion a stick full of knots, and said: 'Shut your eyes, and fear nothing; take this in your hand, and no harm will happen to you.' After a little time, at Zequiél's bidding, Torralva opened his eyes, and he found himself so near the sea, that he could have touched the water with his hand; and the black cloud which had previously enveloped him gave place immediately to so bright a light, that he was afraid of being burnt. Zequiél saw his alarm, and rebuked him for it in a familiar phrase, '*No temas, bestia fiera!*' (fear nothing, stupid fellow.) Torralva then shut his eyes again, and after awhile felt himself on the solid ground, and heard his companion bid him open his eyes, and see if he knew where he was. He recognised the city of Rome spread out before him, and knew that he was standing on the tower of Nona. The clock of the castle of St. Angelo was just striking the hour of midnight, so that they had been exactly one hour on their journey. The city was then shrouded in night, and they waited till daybreak, when they passed through the different parts of the city, and witnessed the events of that terrible day; the attack of the besiegers, the death of the Constable of Bourbon, the flight of the Pope into the Castle of St. Angelo, the terror and slaughter of the citizens, the pollution of the churches, and the wild riot of the conquerors. It took them an hour and a half to return to Valladolid; and when Zequiél left the doctor there, he said to him: 'In future you will believe all I tell you.' Torralva immediately made public all he had seen during this extraordinary excursion; and when in due course

of time news arrived of the capture and sack of Rome, the court of Spain was filled with astonishment.

"Torralva's fame as a magician was now in every body's mouth ; and it seems that men of high rank, both in church and state, had been cognisant of, if not accomplices in, his practices of forbidden arts. It was at length by one of his intimate friends that he was denounced to the Inquisitors, who would perhaps have taken no notice of him had they not been urged to the pursuit. Diego de Zuñiga, the same who had been so long a confidant in his intercourse with the familiar, and who had even benefited by his arts to profit at the gambling-table, had suddenly become fanatical and superstitious. Not satisfied with repentance for his own sins, Zuñiga denounced Torralva to the Inquisition of Cuença ; and when the doctor visited that city at the beginning of the year 1528, he was arrested and thrown into prison. He immediately confessed all his dealings with Zequiël, whom he persisted in regarding as a good angel, and made no less than eight several written declarations ; the same in effect, but contradicting each other in some of the particulars. As these seem to have been thought not to be entirely satisfactory, Torralva was put to the torture, the result of which was that he declared himself convinced that Zequiël was a demon. He said that his familiar had warned him that a danger hung over him if he went to Cuença at that time, but that he had disregarded the admonition.

"The Inquisitors now changed their severity to indulgence ; and on the 6th of March, 1529, they suspended Torralva's process for a year. But before the expiration of that period a new accuser presented himself, and deposed to his disputes at Rome in his younger days on the immortality of the soul and the divinity of Jesus Christ. This placed the question in a new light ; and Torralva underwent examination again on the 29th of January, 1530, when he made a new declaration on the subject of his early education and opinions. The case now assumed a still more serious character ; and the Inquisitors of Cuença having communicated with the supreme council of the Inquisition in Spain, received directions to appoint some pious and learned persons to labour for the conversion of the accused, and to persuade him to renounce, sincerely and absolutely, the science of chiromancy, his intercourse with Zequiël, and all treaties he might have entered into with the evil one, for the unburdening of his conscience and the salvation of his soul. The Inquisitors entrusted this task to brother Augustino Barragan, prior of the convent of Dominicans at Cuença, and Diego Manriques, a canon of the cathedral ; and these men laboured with so much zeal and effect, that Torralva agreed to do every thing they wished, except that he would not undertake to see Zequiël no more. For it appears that the familiar remained so far faithful to his original promise, that he continued to visit Torralva in the prison of the Inquisition, and the doctor represented to his converters that he was obliged to see him whether he would or not. The Inquisitors themselves were so credulous, that

they requested their prisoner to inquire of Zequiél what was his opinion of the doctrines of Luther and Erasmus; and they were gratified beyond measure when they learnt that he condemned the two reformers, with this difference only, that he considered Luther to be a bad man, while he represented Erasmus as his superior in cunning and cleverness. Perhaps this piece of information brought Torralva a little into favour, and his treatment was not so rigorous as that experienced by many at the hands of the same prosecutors. On the 6th of March, 1531, he was condemned to make the general ordinary abjuration of heresies, to undergo the punishment of imprisonment and the *san benito* as long as it might please the Inquisitor-general, to undertake to have no further communication with the spirit Zequiél, and never to lend an ear to any of his proposals.

“Although Torralva had been betrayed by one friend, he had others who remained faithful to him. Before his celebrated journey to Rome in 1525, he had been appointed to the office of physician to the family of the Admiral of Castile, Don Frederico Enriquez, which he still held at the time of his arrest. The admiral had always proved himself a warm friend and a staunch protector; he did not desert him in his trials; and it was no doubt to his influential interference that Torralva owed what indulgence was shewn to him during his imprisonment. We have every reason to believe that it was through his protection also that, soon after the process was ended, the Inquisitor-general gave Torralva his pardon and set him at liberty, in consequence, as it was pretended, of his sincere repentance. The admiral received the magician again as his physician, and continued his favour and protection to him.

“Such is the history, taken entirely from his own declarations and confessions, of a magician whose fame has been immortalised in *Don Quixote*.”

The readers of Walter Scott are familiar with the ghost-story in the novel of *Woodstock*. Mr. Wright gives it as originally told. Whether it *was* trick or no, has never apparently been discovered; though we see no reason why the devil should not torment the puritan commissioners as well as their cavalier foes. Mr. Wright winds up the tale with an “It is said;” the usual formula by which all professedly supernatural stories are disposed of. The story itself is not more strange than others to be heard of at the present day; but we give it as a specimen of a narrative totally unlike in character to that of the romantic Dr. Torralva.

“After Charles’s death, the royal property was confiscated to the state, and commissioners were appointed by parliament to survey and sell the crown lands. Among the royal estates was the manor of Woodstock, of which the parliamentary commissioners were sent to take possession in the month of October, 1649. The more fana-

tical part of the opponents of royalty had always taught that, through witches and otherwise, the devil was actively engaged in the service of their opponents, battling against them ; and they now found him resolved upon more open hostilities than ever. . On the 3d of October the commissioners, with their servants, went to the manor-hall, and took up their lodgings in the king's own rooms, the bed-chamber and withdrawing-room : the former they used as their kitchen, the council-hall was their brewhouse, the chamber of presence served as their place of sitting to despatch business, and the dining-room was used as a woodhouse, where they laid the wood of 'that ancient standard in the high park, known of all by the name of the king's oak, which (that nothing might remain that had the name of king affixed to it) they digged up by the roots.' On the 14th and 15th they had little disturbance ; but on the 16th there came, as they thought, something into the bed-chamber, where two of the commissioners and their servant lay, in the shape of a dog, which going under their bed, did as it were gnaw their bed-cords ; but on the morrow finding them whole, and a quarter of beef which lay on the ground untouched, they 'began to entertain other thoughts.'—October 17th. Something, to their thinking, removed all the wood of the king's oak out of the dining-room to the presence-chamber, and hurled the chairs and stools up and down that room ; from whence it came into the two chambers where the two commissioners and their servants lay, and hoisted up their bed-feet so much higher than their heads, that they thought they should have been turned over and over ; and then let them fall down with such force, that their bodies rebounded from the bed a good distance ; and then shook the bedsteads so violently, that they declared their bodies were sore with it. On the 18th something came into the chamber and walked up and down, and fetching the warming-pan out of the withdrawing-room, made so much noise that they thought fire-bells could not have made more. Next day trenchers were thrown up and down the dining-room, and at those who slept there ; one of them being wakened, put forth his head to see what was the matter, and had trenchers thrown at him. On the 20th, the curtains of the bed in the withdrawing-room were drawn to and fro, the bedstead was much shaken, and eight great pewter dishes and three dozen of trenchers thrown about the bed-chamber again. This night they also thought a whole armful of the wood of the king's oak was thrown down in their chamber, but of that in the morning they found nothing had been moved. On the 21st, the keeper of their ordinary and his bitch lay in one of the rooms with them, and on that night they were not disturbed at all. But on the 22d, though the bitch slept there again, to which circumstance they had ascribed their former night's rest, both they and it were in 'a pitiful taking,' the latter 'opening but once, and then with a whining fearful yelp.'—October 23. They had all their clothes plucked off them in the withdrawing-room, and the bricks fell out of the chimney into the room. On the 24th they thought in the dining-room that all the wood of the king's oak had been brought thither, and thrown

down close by their bed-side, which being heard by those of the withdrawing-room, 'one of them rose to see what was done, fearing indeed his fellow-commissioners had been killed, but found no such matter. Whereupon returning to his bed again, he found two or three dozen of trenchers thrown into it, and handsomely covered with the bed-clothes.'

"The commissioners persisted in retaining possession, and were subjected to new persecutions. On the 25th of October the curtains of the bed in the withdrawing-room were drawn to and fro, and the bedstead shaken, as before; and in the bed-chamber, glass flew about so thick (and yet not one of the chamber-windows broken), that they thought it had rained money; whereupon they lighted candles, but 'to their grief they found nothing but glass.' On the 29th something going to the window opened and shut it, then going into the bed-chamber, it threw great stones for half an hour's time, some whereof fell on the high-bed, others on the truckle-bed, to the number in all of above fourscore. This night there was also a very great noise, as if forty pieces of ordnance had been shot off together. It astonished all the neighbourhood, and it was thought it must have been heard a great way off. During these noises, which were heard in both rooms together, the commissioners and their servants were struck with so great horror, that they cried out one to another for help; whereupon one of them recovering himself out of a 'strange agony' he had been in, snatched a sword, and had like to have killed one of his brethren coming out of his bed in his shirt, whom he took for the spirit that did the mischief. However, at length they got all together; yet the noise continued so great and terrible, and shook the walls so much, that they thought the whole manor would have fallen on their heads. At the departure of the supernatural disturber of their repose, 'it took all the glass of the windows away with it.' On the 1st of November, something, as the commissioners thought, walked up and down the withdrawing-room, and then made a noise in the dining-room. The stones which were left before, and laid up in the withdrawing-room, were all fetched away this night, and a great deal of glass (not like the former) thrown about again.

"On the 2d of November, there came something into the withdrawing-room, treading, as they conceived, much like a bear, which began by walking about for a quarter of an hour, and then at length it made a noise about the table, and threw the warming-pan so violently that it was quite spoiled. It threw also a glass and great stones at the commissioners again, and the bones of horses; and all so violently, that the bedstead and the walls were bruised by them. That night they planted candles all about the rooms, and made fires up to the 'rattle-trees' of the chimney, but all were put out, nobody knew how, the fire and burnt wood being thrown up and down the room; the curtains were torn with the rods from their beds, and the bed-posts pulled away, that the tester fell down upon them, and the feet of the bedstead were cloven into two. The servants in the truckle-bed, who lay all the time sweating for fear, were treated even

worse ; for there came upon them first a little which made them begin to stir, but before they could get out, it was followed by a whole tubful, as it were, of stinking ditch-water, so green that it made their shirts and sheets of that colour too. The same night the windows were all broke by throwing of stones, and there was most terrible noises in three several places together near them. Nay, the very rabbit-stealers who were abroad that night were so affrighted with the dismal thundering, that for haste they left their ferrets in the holes behind them, beyond Rosamond's well. Notwithstanding all this, one of them had the boldness to ask, in the name of God, what it would have, and what they had done that they should be so disturbed after this manner. To which no answer was given, but the noise ceased for a while. At length it came again, and, as all of them said, brought seven devils worse than itself. Whereupon one of them lighted a candle again, and set it between the two chambers in the doorway ; on which another fixing his eyes, saw the similitude of a hoof striking the candle and candlestick into the middle of the bed-chamber, and afterwards making three scrapes on the snuff to put it out. Upon this, the same person was so bold as to draw his sword, but he had scarce got it out, but there was another invisible hand had hold of it too, and tugged with him for it ; and prevailing, struck him so violently, that he was stunned with the blow. Then began violent noises again, insomuch that they calling to one another, got together, and went into the presence-chamber, where they said prayers and sang psalms ; notwithstanding all which, the thundering noises still continued in other rooms. After this, on the 3d of November, they removed their lodging over the gate ; and next day, being Sunday, went to Ewelme, 'where how they escaped the authors of the relation knew not, but returning on Monday, the devil (for that was the name they gave their nightly guest) left them not unvisited, nor on the Tuesday following, which was the last day they stayed.' The courage even of the devout commissioners of the parliament was not proof against a persecution like this, and the manor of Woodstock was relieved from their presence. It is said that one of the old retainers of the house, years afterwards, confessed that he had entered the service of the commissioners, in order, by playing these tricks upon them, which he was enabled to do by his intimate acquaintance with the secret passages of the lodge, to rescue it from their grasp."

We must give one more extract, as an illustration of Calvinistic exorcism. The story looks uncommonly like a cute hit at "prelacy and popery." Here we have a sort of Puseyite devil, with an intense love for five separate abominations ;—popish books, the "Book of Common Prayer," Oxford and Cambridge jests, Quakers' books, and a book written to prove there were no witches !

"There were in Boston, in North America, two ministers (father and son), who, for many reasons, held a distinguished place among

the clergy of New England, and their opinions were looked up to with the utmost respect. These were Increase and Cotton Mather, the first principal, and the second a fellow of Haward College. These men seem to have studied deeply the doctrines on the subject of witchcraft which had so long been held in Europe, and to have been fully convinced of their truth. Cotton Mather was called in to witness the afflictions with which Goodwin's children were visited; and not content with what he saw there, he took the girl whose visitations seemed most extraordinary to his own home, that he might examine her more leisurely; and he has left us a printed account of his observations. It appears that some of the stories of European witchcraft had been impressed on her mind; for when in her fits, she believed that the witches came for her with a horse, on which she rode to their meetings. Sometimes, in the presence of a number of persons, she would suddenly fall into a sort of trance; and then she would jump into a chair, and placing herself in a riding posture, move as if she were successively ambling, trotting, and galloping. At the same time she would talk with invisible company that seemed to go with her, and she would listen to their answers. After continuing in this way two or three minutes, she seemed to think herself at a meeting of the witches, a great distance from the house where she was sitting; then she would return again on her imaginary horse, and come to herself again; and on one occasion she told Cotton Mather of three persons she had seen at the meeting. Dr. Mather's simplicity, to say the least, was shewn by the sort of experiments he made on this fantastical patient. When she was in her fits, and therefore under the influence of Satan, she read or listened to bad books with pleasure, but good books threw her into convulsions. He tried her with the Bible, the Assembly's Catechism, his grandfather Cotton Mather's *Milk for Babes*, and his father Increase's *Remarkable Providences*, with a treatise written to prove the reality of witchcraft and the existence of witches. These good books, Cotton Mather tells us, 'were mortal to her;' they threw her into trances and convulsions. Next he tried her with books of a different character, such as Quakers' books (the Quakers were looked upon with a very evil eye in New England), Popish books, the Cambridge and Oxford Jests, a Prayer-book (against which the Puritans always professed the greatest hostility), and a book written to prove that there were no witches. These the devil let her read as long as she liked; and he shewed particular respect to the Prayer-book, even allowing her to read the passages of Scripture in it, although he threw her into the most dreadful sufferings if she attempted to read the same texts in the Bible."

SHORT NOTICES.

MR. FINLASON has followed up his pamphlet on the Papal Supremacy by another: *The Catholic Hierarchy vindicated by the Law of England* (Dolman). The argument is novel, curious, and important, and the author has treated it with great learning and acuteness. We recommend it to the study of all persons who would acquaint themselves with the relationship of Church and State in this country before the Reformation.

One of the most admirable of books, *Thomas à Kempis's Following of Christ*, has at length found a fit translator. The new translation just issued by Burns and Lambert gives the original with all its own exquisite simplicity and grace. A few good illustrations make the edition every thing that can be desired.

A few Words about Music, by M. H. (Novello), is an intelligent and agreeable little collection of suggestions and information well worth the attention of amateur pianists. The authoress appends a sketch of the rise and progress of the art of music, which adds to the value of her work.

The authoress of *Kate Devereux, a Story of Modern Life* (Bentley), has succeeded in writing a novel which, though only incidentally touching on Catholic subjects, gives a truthful representation of all that it introduces. The story itself shews a good deal of cleverness, and claims a very fair place among the novels of the season.

The Third Annual Report of the Missionary College of Drumcondra (Dublin, Fowler), like its predecessors, is full of interest, and shews undeniably the distinguished merits of the Catholic Missionary College of Ireland. Few "Reports" are so well worth reading. We should remind our English readers that some of the students having come to serve English missions, the College has a special as well as general claim on their support.

The Bishop and the Cross, by Franciscus (Richardson), is a severe handling of Dr. Blomfield, the Bishop of London, for his recent offensive remarks on the use of the Cross as an incentive to devotion.

Mr. Collin de Plancy's Legends of the Seven Capital Sins (Dolman), now first translated, forms a sequel to his *Legends on the Commandments*. Like the latter, they are not imaginary narratives; and they are really one of the best collections of historical illustrations of Catholic doctrines and morals that are to be met with.

The Order of Laying the First Stone of a New Church, according to the Roman Pontifical (Burns and Lambert) is a useful reprint.

The London Catholic Church and Chapel Directory (Dolman) is a convenient and opportune manual for visitors to London.

Correspondence.

PROPOSAL FOR A "PRIEST'S PORTFOLIO."

To the Editor of the Rambler.

St. Peter's, Great Marlow, May 29, 1851.

DEAR MR. RAMBLER,—I think I have sometimes seen letters appended to your spirited journal; so that if I ask you to publish a few lines in the same form, I shall not be claiming any infraction of your editorial rules. I wish, through you, to put out a feeler to the Clergy in general, whether it would not be practicable for us Priests to have a little periodical of our own. I have heard more than one Priest express his sense of our want of something of the kind; and they were men who would be of the greatest assistance to such a publication, if it were begun. Priests have what one might almost call a language of their own, to the uninitiated bystander as unintelligible as the "*Ordo recitandi*" was to Exeter Hall. And Priests take interest in things that few others care about; at all events, when carried to the minute detail to which we carry them. In a country like ours, in which Priests see so little of one another, it would be a matter of the greatest convenience for us to have a journal of our own, in which we might communicate with one another on points that interest ourselves. I should therefore think that a little sheet, which might be called the "*Priest's Portfolio*," would do good service in these times. The object would not be for those who had questions to ask to send them to be answered by the oracular acuteness of a newspaper editor; but that in one number half a dozen Priests might print questions that they wish to propose to their brethren, and that then in succeeding numbers one might send his opinion, and another some other solution; and thus doubtful points might be, what "*D. C. L.*" calls, ventilated. Thus Priests who have access to good libraries might be of very great assistance to those who have not such a privilege. Again, Priests who have been educated in different places might be of great use to one another. Of course, it would require some consideration to determine the limits of such a design; whether, for instance, it should be allowable to ask the solution of moral cases. My own view was rather directed to doubts in rubric and canon law; and as these are matters of book knowledge, what we used to call "*cram*," it would be very useful to be able to write and ask any Priest who had such and such a book to tell me what it said. The questions that we should wish to ask one another would be generally totally inapplicable to the pages of a newspaper, as well as uninteresting to most readers. I give a specimen or two of the sort of question that I should be glad to ask:

1. I am told that perhaps Pope Clement XIV. granted four of the eight Indulgences, in addition to the four given by Benedict XIV., and that my informant thinks he has seen some rescript in an *Ordo* of 1776, or thereabouts. Can any one find any *direct* act of the Pope granting those four? or any act giving any validity to that for SS. Peter and Paul? And what effect has the rescript of Sept. 29, 1850? Can it validate what seems really never to have existed?

2. By what right is St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi kept in England on the 3d of June? Do those who say her office on that day satisfy the obligation?

3. What ceremony is to be used for the communion of persons in health, in their own houses or in prisons?

4. What is the authority of the English Ritual? Which is the original and authorised edition? Because of course it requires great authority to supplant the Roman Ritual.

5. Should the server kneel or stand during the *Credo* in a low Mass?

6. What constitutes the publication of an Indulgence by the Ordinary? Is any thing required beyond the countersignature and seal?

7. Are those Masses allowed in which the words of the *Gloria* or *Credo* are curtailed for the choir?

Besides questions such as these, a Priest may wish to know the date and reference to decrees of the different Congregations, especially of the Rites; for *Gardellini* is not within every one's reach, and the *Manuale Decretorum* has no index. It would be very useful too to be able to print a bull for the use of those who cannot afford to buy a *Bullarium*, such as that of Pope Alexander VII. on the College oath. And now also when diocesan synods begin to be held, and canon-law books are not in great abundance among us, those who are happy in their libraries can make themselves exceedingly useful.

And further, a Priest is sometimes obliged for some special purpose to study a subject with care; if he had some strictly clerical journal in which to publish his paper, it would be the means of preserving from destruction essays well worth preservation.

However, Sir, I should be greatly pleased if we had the means of talking to one another, perhaps something in the style of "Notes and Queries:" and I am sure that to Priests such a publication would, in a short time, be full of interest.

I am, Mr. Rambler,

Your very obedient servant,

JOHN MORRIS.

[There would be one great difficulty in the way of the success of such a publication as our Correspondent proposes; it *could not possibly pay its expenses* while the number of our Clergy remains so small. We think, however, that the object proposed might, to a great extent, be attained by the insertion of such "Notes and Queries" as Mr. Morris suggests in this portion of the *Rambler* itself. There are probably few Priests who would subscribe to the supposed periodical, who do not see the *Rambler* regularly; and as the queries and their answers would never be very lengthy, we could easily devote to them whatever space was necessary for the purpose. The object appears most desirable; and there can be little doubt that many of the questions proposed would have an interest to others besides the clergy; though a periodical *professedly* clerical in its contents would obtain few lay subscribers. Any replies which we may receive to the questions here proposed by Mr. Morris, with any further queries from other quarters, we shall be happy to insert in our next Number. To insure insertion, all communications must reach the publisher of the *Rambler* by the 10th of each month, and must be directed, *To the Editor of the Rambler, to the care of Messrs. Burns and Lambert, 17 Portman Street, Portman Square, London.* Brevity also must be always consulted, as far as circumstances will permit. All communications to be postpaid.—EDIT. RAMBLER.]

ST. JOSEPH AND MR. PUGIN.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Mr. Pugin remarks in his late publication, that “the idea of representing St. Joseph holding our Lord in his arms” is “in utter opposition to the ancient school of Christian art,” and “shews a disregard of ancient traditions.” This is indeed strange language, coming from Mr. Pugin, as the following fact will fully shew. He was commissioned, not very long since, to design and order two stained glass windows for the community-room of the Convent of Mercy in this town; one of our Blessed Lady and one of St. Joseph. In due course of time they reached their destination, and were fitted up in the south end of the room. It is needless to observe that they are all that the true lover of true Christian art could desire. From the relative position in which they are placed, they were evidently designed to form an harmonious contrast the one to the other. Our Blessed Lady is standing *alone*, with a book in one hand :

“The Virgin Mother ever blest,
Sweetest, gentlest, holiest.”

In the other window St. Joseph is represented “*holding our Lord in his arms* ;” and the Divine Child is looking towards him with the most intense love and affection. How will Mr. Pugin reconcile the fact of these two windows with his present theory?

I may be allowed to add, that several Bishops and persons in high ecclesiastical authority have seen the above windows, and as yet no murmur of disapprobation or condemnation has been heard. On the contrary, all have praised them. The idea so beautifully embodied in them is the very idea embodied in the Church’s office, and repeatedly affirmed by the whole Church throughout the year.

“Tu natum Dominum stringis,” &c.
“Thine arms embrace thy Maker.”

Your obedient servant,

J. J. MULLIGAN.

Nottingham, May 26, 1851.

Ecclesiastical Register.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES.

THE following articles, extracted from the *Concordat* just established between the Holy See and Spain, deserve the special attention of all Catholics who profess to be supporters of the theory of "religious liberty." They are taken from the translation just published in the *Tablet*.

THE SPANISH CONCORDAT,

Agreed upon between his Holiness and her Catholic Majesty, signed at Madrid on the 16th of March, 1851, and ratified by her Majesty on the 1st April, and by his Holiness on the 23d of the same month.

[Translated from the *Gaceta de Madrid* of May 12th, 1851.]

His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff Pius IX., having a lively desire of providing for the good of religion and the usefulness of the Church of Spain, in the pastoral solicitude which he entertains for all faithful Catholics, and in his especial good will for the renowned and devout Spanish nation; and her majesty, the Catholic Queen Isabella II., animated by the same desire, directed by piety and by a sincere adherence to the apostolic see—sentiments which she has inherited from her ancestors—have resolved to conclude a solemn concordat, in which shall be regulated all ecclesiastical affairs in a stable and canonical manner.

For this end the Sovereign Pontiff has been pleased to nominate for his minister plenipotentiary his Excellency Don Juan Brunelli, Archbishop of Thessalonica, domestic prelate of his holiness, assistant to the pontifical throne, and nuncio apostolic in the kingdom of Spain, with the powers of *legate à latere*; and her majesty the Catholic Queen, the Lord Don Manuel Bertran de Lis, Knight Grand Cross of the royal and distinguished order of Charles III. of Spain, of the order of St. Maurice and Lazarus of Sardinia, of the order of Francis I. of Naples, deputy to the Cortes and her minister of foreign affairs; who, after having mutually given in their full powers respectively, and recognised the authenticity thereof, have agreed to the following:—

Art. 1. The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, which, to the exclusion of all other worship, continues to be the sole religion of the Spanish people, shall always be preserved in the states of her Catholic Majesty, with all the rights and prerogatives which it ought to enjoy according to the laws of God and the dispositions of the sacred canons.

Art. 2. Consequently instruction in the universities, colleges, seminaries, and public or private schools of what class soever, shall be entirely conformable to the doctrine of the Catholic religion, and the bishops and other diocesan prelates, charged by their office to watch over the purity of doctrine, of faith, and of morals, shall never meet with any obstacle in the exercise of this surveillance, even in the public schools.

Art. 3. The prelates and the other sacred ministers aforesaid shall never meet with any hindrance in the exercise of their functions; no person shall molest them, on any pretext, in whatever relates to the fulfilment of the duties of their office; on the contrary, all the authorities of the kingdom shall take care to render, and to cause to be rendered, to them the respect and consideration which are due to them according

to the divine precepts, and will see that nothing be done which can bring on them disrespect or contempt.

Her Majesty and her royal government will lend their powerful patronage and their support to the bishops in cases where they shall ask it, principally where they shall have occasion to oppose themselves to the malice of men who attempt to pervert the minds of the faithful, and to corrupt their morals, or where they shall have occasion to hinder the publication, introduction, or circulation of bad or hurtful books.

Art. 4. In all other things belonging to the right and to the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority, and to the ministry of the sacred orders, the bishops and the clergy depending on them shall enjoy the full liberty which the sacred canons establish.

As an illustration of the mode in which "religious liberty" is understood in Italy, the *Examiner* has recently given the following:

On the 7th May last, the Count Piero Guicciardini, a man of well-known loyalty and excellent character, met six others in a private house at Florence. In the course of the interview, the Count read and expounded a chapter of St. John's Gospel. Before they separated, eight armed officers entered the house, and having ascertained what had been done, led them away to the public prison, where they were confined ten days, and repeatedly examined. At last, they were sentenced to a forced residence for six months in different parts of the Tuscan Maremma. The decree of the Council of Prefecture in which this sentence is declared, after specifying the names of the offenders and other particulars, thus proceeds:

"Whereas it is equally proved by the declarations of the accused themselves, that on this occasion Count Piero Guicciardini read and commented on a chapter of the Gospel of St. John, according to the Italian translation attributed to Giovanni Diodati: whereas the results of the process offer valid and sufficient proofs to conclude that this reading and comment had no other purpose than mutually to insinuate into the parties religious sentiments and principles contrary to those prescribed by the Roman Catholic apostolic religion, and this idea is manifestly and incontrovertibly confirmed by propositions and perverse maxims proclaimed in the books and manuscripts found on the persons and in the homes of the aforesaid accused: whereas on the ground of the evidence, it ought to be concluded that previous to the said evening of the 7th of May, by means of the same individuals, there had taken place at different epochs and localities, where other parties were present, similar meetings, always directed to insinuate and propagate anti-Catholic sentiments and principles: whereas from these facts there follows necessarily the proof of the existence of a plot directed to overthrow the religion of the State, and that of this plot the above-named Count Piero Guicciardini, Cesare Magrini, Angelo Guarducci, Fedele Betti, Carlo Solaini, Sebastiano Borsieri, and Giuseppe Guerra, have become the accomplices. For these reasons, having seen the 2d article of the sovereign decree of the 25th April, 1851, the Council decree that the aforesaid parties must be subjected to a forced residence for six months respectively; Count Piero Guicciardini at Volterra, Cesare Magrini at Montieri, Angelo Guarducci at Gluncarico, Fedele Betti at Orbetello, Carlo Solaini at Cinigiano, Sebastiano Borsieri at Rocca Strada, and Giuseppe Guerra at Piombino. And in conformity with the order of the Prefecture of this day, there is assigned to * * * the term of twenty-four hours to remove from the capital, with the obligation to

present himself within the term of four days with the passport which has been given him before the delegate of government of the district of * * * there to commence undergoing his penalty, at the risk of being taken by force, in case of disobedience.

"From the Delegation of Government of the quarter of Sta. Maria Novelle, 16th May, 1851. G. BARTOLINI, Chancellor.

"Per copia conforme, D. Pettinucci."

The *Examiner* says, "Six of the condemned have been since permitted to leave Tuscany, instead of undergoing the penalty of compulsory residence in the unwholesome Maremma."

MISSION AND VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF MADURA, EAST INDIES.

WE are anxious to call attention to the subjoined statement of a case which has very strong claims on English Catholics:

The Vicariate of Madura is situated in the southern part of the peninsula of Hindostan, and comprises a district of about 200 miles long, and 120 broad. It contains about 150,000 Catholics, scattered here and there, in a country inhabited by about three or four millions of Hindoos and Mussulmans. It is entirely under the English dominion.

St. Francis Xavier was the first missionary of the Society of Jesus who preached our holy religion in this country; he evangelised and frequently visited the sea-coasts, and once, disappearing for eight days, he penetrated alone into the interior, but returned, saying, that "these people were not as yet prepared to receive the kingdom of God."

Rev. Father de Nobilii, nephew of Cardinal Bellarmin, was the first who succeeded in establishing Christianity in the interior. He converted thousands to the faith, and his labours were followed up for near 150 years by a constant succession of Jesuit missionaries, many of whom sealed their faith with their blood; amongst others the Venerable P. de Britto, the cause of whose canonisation is at present under consideration. The mission remained in the hands of the Society of Jesus until the suppression of the order; afterwards, by degrees, as the missionaries then in the country died, their places were supplied by native clergy from Goa, under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa. The want of zeal and education among these clergymen gradually caused the congregations in the different districts to fall away, until little remained but the bare name of Catholic. This continued till 1838, when, in consequence of repeated petitions from the Christians of the country, the mission was again confided to the Society of Jesus.

The Goa clergy, then in possession of all our ancient churches in India, refused to acknowledge any orders from Rome which were not forwarded through their own government; they rose in open resistance, opposed in every possible way the return of the European missionaries, and positively refused all obedience to the Bishops and Vicars-Apostolic appointed by Rome. Hence what is termed the Goa schism.

Since 1838 more than sixty Jesuit missionaries have been sent out to the Madura Vicariate, and above one-third of that number, in the short space of ten years, have fallen victims to the climate and to the privations inseparable from their position. Amongst those whose loss was most severely felt, were Rev. Father Garnier, the superior of the mis-

sion, and the Hon. Father Clifford, by whose death the Vicariate lost its only English missionary.

The sole funds which the mission furnishes for its own support is a sum varying from two to three hundred pounds per annum, contributed by the natives, and a small salary given by government to the English Catholic chaplain at Trichinopoly (less than one-fifth of the pay of a Protestant clergyman on the small salary). The rest of the funds have been contributed chiefly by the "Propagation de la Foi," and have hitherto barely sufficed to furnish the necessities of life to the missionaries, two pounds sterling per month being about the average expenditure of each. The want of funds has thus rendered it absolutely impossible to undertake and carry out those good works so necessary for the advancement of religion.

On the other hand, the various Protestant missions, by their own shewing, have expended considerably above two millions sterling in the last thirty years, while the number of their converts is considerably below 60,000, at which they state them.

The only thing which has hitherto been attempted is an ecclesiastical seminary and college, which have been set on foot by funds given and collected for the purpose. This establishment has succeeded beyond our expectations, though in the very beginning of its prosperity we suffered a heavy loss in having the whole establishment destroyed by fire in a few hours; a large and valuable library sent us from Europe was entirely lost. The new building is still quite unfinished.

In the present state of our mission, immense good may be done, if we only had the necessary means at our disposal.

We are therefore obliged to appeal to the charity of the Catholics of Europe to assist in some of the good works, which seem to have become absolutely necessary for the greater glory of God and the advancement of our holy religion.

The principal things which his Lordship the Vicar Apostolic and the Missioners are most anxious about are the following:

1. The completion of the college and seminary.
2. The establishment of elementary schools in some of the principal towns, in order to meet the efforts of the Protestants, in whose hands hitherto, on account of our absolute want of funds, nearly all the Christian education of the country has necessarily been.
3. A convent for the education of girls, and where likewise many native Christians, who desire earnestly to devote themselves to religious life, might be received.
4. An hospital for the old and infirm, numbers of whom would by this means be enabled to save their souls.

Subscriptions will be thankfully received by the Rev. W. Strickland, at No. 9 Hill Street, Berkeley Square, and by Henry Barnwall, Esq., Commercial Bank of London, 6 Henrietta Street, and Edward Jerningham, Esq., London Joint Stock Bank, 69 Pall Mall.

Prayers.—One mass will be said every Saturday till the 1st of January, for those who will kindly circulate this paper, and make known the wants of the mission.

An alms of 50*l.* gives a special right to the prayers usually said for benefactors and founders, viz. a mass each month for every missionary, and a participation in their other prayers and good works.

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

AUGUST 1851.

PART XLIV.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

No. I.—*Holy Communion.*

NEXT to the truths of our holy religion and the history of our spiritual mother, the Church, there is no subject more worthy of our attention than that which is generally understood by the name of Christian Antiquities. Of course, the study of this subject is almost necessarily united with the study of the other two; that is, both with Theology and with Ecclesiastical History. Nevertheless it may also be treated independently, as a study by itself; and in some respects it appears to have the advantage over either the one or the other—perhaps for this very reason, because it holds a sort of middle place between the two, partaking in some degree of the nature of both. We do not of course intend to insinuate that the study of Christian Antiquities is really superior either to that of Theology or of Ecclesiastical History, or can, under any circumstances, be supposed to supersede such studies in those who are *bound* to study; but what we mean is this, that it seems to us that it might be made a most valuable instrument of *popular* instruction in this country at the present day. It both implies and conveys a certain degree of theological knowledge, and, in some instances at least, it gives an insight into many intricate passages of Ecclesiastical History; but it is not so dry as the one, nor so long and tedious as the other.

To the great majority of mankind, catechisms of Christian doctrine and dogmatic treatises of any kind, however short, are so extremely distasteful that they can never be persuaded to open them; and if religious knowledge can only be obtained at this price, they are content rather to go without it altogether. Ecclesiastical History, on the other hand, though

not liable to the same objection of being dull and dry, is yet too long for common use; each page does not tell its own tale, so as to convey a distinct moral or theological lesson; you must read and learn a great deal before you can get a clear, consistent view of any part of it. In these days, then, of royal roads to learning, when men are so impatient of toilsome study that they must have the *pith* of every thing (as they say) dished up for them in the leading article of a review, rather than seek it out for themselves even in the broad and handsome pages of a modern octavo, we think the study of Christian Antiquities might be made peculiarly useful, as indirectly bringing before the mind, and insinuating, as it were, rather than inculcating, many of the most important dogmas of our holy religion.

Indeed, we know of few works more calculated to do good service to the cause of religious truth amongst us at the present day, and whose appearance we should hail with greater pleasure, as filling up one of the too numerous voids in English Catholic literature, than a really sound, yet at the same time popular, Manual of Christian Antiquities. Perhaps we have not been very happy in our selection of a title for the book which we desiderate; for we do not mean to say that we wish to see a mere compression of all the principal facts in the goodly quartos of Mamachius, or the more modest octavoes of Selvaggi upon the same subject, *done* into a small duodecimo volume—though even this perhaps might not be altogether an unprofitable labour,—but we mean something much more full and complete, and at the same time more interesting and attractive. In fact, we mean, as nearly as possible, the very thing that has been recently described by a clever writer in the pages of the *Catholic School* (No. V. p. 126). We should like to see a book (or books rather, for the materials would far exceed the limits of a single volume) which should contain, upon *all* subjects of Christian doctrine that are capable of it, something of the same kind of historical illustration that is proposed upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist in the following extract from “A Nun’s Plan of Education.” “1. Some facts drawn from Holy Scripture concerning the figures of the Sacrament; 2. The account of the institution itself, given in an interesting manner, with the circumstances of it; 3. Some stories from the history of the early ages of the Church, to shew the faith of that time; 4. Of heretics who denied the doctrine, so as to shew that its denial is no new or unknown discovery, but one long since exposed and refuted; 5. Facts respecting the visible appearances in the Sacred Host, attested miracles, &c.; 6. Reasons for our particular love and devotion, and their practical effect upon the conduct and character;

7. Some of the Protestant errors which have been, as we have seen, long since refuted by the Church; 8. The punishments which incredulity and irreverence upon this subject have incurred."

We are thoroughly of one mind with the authoress of this sketch, that it is not to be doubted but that the truths of religion placed before men's minds in this way would render them extremely interesting, and impress them very deeply on the understanding, and that no merely verbal explanation of the dogma of the Real Presence, and of the exact formulas of faith by which it is expressed, would ever have the same force as such a full illustration as this; and we earnestly hope that the hint will not be thrown away upon some of those who have leisure and ability thoroughly to carry out the idea in the way that it deserves.

In the following pages this has not of course been attempted. Indeed, if *any* resemblance at all be discoverable between the method proposed by the writer from whom we have just quoted, and that which we have followed ourselves in the few chapters upon the same subject that will be found in the present and two or three future numbers of our Magazine, we beg to assure our readers that the coincidence will have been merely fortuitous, since our remarks were thrown together, even in their present form, at a time when the *Catholic School* was not yet *in esse*. We have only availed ourselves of such resemblance as there undoubtedly is between them, as a convenient opportunity of giving greater publicity to what we conceive to be a very valuable suggestion in the pages of our contemporary; and having done this, we bring these preliminary observations to a close, and shall proceed to treat, in our own way, on the subject indicated by our title.

"In the day that God created man, He made him to his own likeness;" but as soon as he had disobeyed God's word, his nature became deteriorated in all its parts, and this likeness was in a measure lost. Henceforward human nature presented the strange incongruity of a real capacity for virtue bowed down by an overpowering tendency to vice—a faculty and an aptitude for the knowledge and the love of God thwarted, and practically rendered inoperative, by the preponderance of evil desire. And this was the great problem which perplexed the ancient world, and in the solution of which so many and such diverse courses were pursued.

Amongst the great majority of the heathen, it would almost seem as though the lying promise of Satan had been repeated in broken and mysterious echoes from generation to

generation, saying, "You shall be as gods, if only you will obey my words;" "All this will I give you, if, falling down, you will adore me;" so earnest were they in the systematic indulgence of every evil passion, each seeking to surpass the other in the invention or the practice of more cruel and debasing rites. Here and there, however, might be found some few individuals, who, either because they listened more attentively to the secret whisperings of the higher part of their nature, or that there reached them some scanty record of primitive tradition, or some indistinct reflection of a distant and limited revelation, certainly ordered their lives with a more steady regularity; either busying themselves in the exercise of the social and domestic virtues, or yielding obedience to the rules of an austere philosophy. Amid this chaos of opinions and practices, religious and irreligious, at first sight so irreconcilable with one another, it has been observed by a modern French author, that traces may almost universally be discovered, more or less distinct, of a remembrance of lost privileges, and of a desire to recover them; nay, even of a hope that such a recovery was possible; and that the ultimate object of this hope was always an approximation to, if not an actual union with, Deity itself. The ingenious author to whom we refer has attempted to demonstrate this proposition even with reference to some of the grossest fables of heathen mythologies; but, however this may be, there certainly is truth in the remark as far as regards some of the systems of ancient philosophy. For whereas perfection of happiness has always been considered an inalienable attribute of Divinity, the highest good attainable by man was uniformly represented as consisting only in that occupation, be it what it may, whereon Divinity was engaged. The Epicurean idea, for instance, of the nature of God, revelling in undisturbed repose, because the government of the world was too laborious, naturally connected itself with a code of morals in which discipline and self-restraint were unknown, and which in popular practice, therefore, became lax and licentious; whilst the Peripatetics, on the contrary, whose Deity was ever absorbed in the highest intellectual exercise, taught their disciples to curb their passions and bring them into subjection, in order that they might devote the whole energies of their being to habits of unearthly contemplation. Indeed, Aristotle expressly recommends and confirms his theory of man's greatest good by an appeal to its superhuman character—its resemblance to Divinity.

Thus, all ancient wisdom and worship, and even the errors and superstitions connected with them, may be regarded as in some measure the prophetic aspiration of mankind, crying

aloud for a re-union with their Creator. And if this be true of the Gentile world, it is of course infinitely more so of the chosen people, whose whole history was a divinely-appointed preface and preparation for that re-union, and all their laws and ceremonies only types and figures of the manner in which it should be accomplished. Yet how faint and imperfect a conception of the reality was granted either to the Jew or Gentile! To the one it had been dimly shadowed forth in prophetic mysteries; to the other it had been presented in disfigured guise by obscure and corrupt traditions; yet both alike failed to recognise it when it came; and He who had been for ages "the desired of nations" was at first rejected by all: "He came unto his own, and his own received Him not; the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not."

And, in truth, the Incarnation is a mystery of humility and of love, such as must needs perplex and amaze the mind of the natural man—a mystery which, as nothing but the wisdom of God could have conceived, his mercy purposed, and his power executed; so faith alone, which is his gift, can apprehend and receive. "O the infinite riches of the goodness of God!" exclaims St. Chrysostom; "O wonderful mystery which every where surrounds me! I once partook of his likeness, but I did not retain it; He now partakes of my flesh, that He may restore that likeness, and render my flesh immortal. Behold, He communicates with us in a second communion more wonderful than the former: in the former He gave to us a share in something that was superior to ourselves; in the second He himself receives a share in what is inferior to his own nature. This is far more divine than the former, and, to those who consider aright, far more amazing. O strange and unheard-of union! He who is self-existent is made; the Uncreated is created; the Infinite is confined within limits; He who maketh rich is Himself made poor, taking upon Him the poverty of my flesh, that I may be made rich by his Divinity; He who filleth all things is Himself made empty, emptying Himself for awhile of his own glory, that I may be made partaker of his fulness; He, of whom it had been said, 'let all the angels adore Him,' receives the homage of brute beasts, of humble shepherds, and of pilgrim strangers; He, whose are all the beasts of the woods, the cattle on the hills, and the fowls of the air, suffers hunger and thirst, and receives the supply of his most necessary wants from the ministering hands of others; the Lord of all power and might is led away bound by soldiers; the Lord of glory is put to open shame; and, finally, the Lord of life suffers a cruel and lingering death."

All this was done that the justice of God might be satisfied in our behalf, and that there might be purchased for us an entrance into the kingdom of heaven; but it still remained to make us individually partakers in these benefits; and for this purpose it was necessary to provide something more nearly personal to ourselves. - Jesus Christ, born in the stable at Bethlehem, going about doing good in Judæa, suffering on the Cross at Mount Calvary, rising again on the third day, and ascending into heaven, was still in a manner strange and foreign to us; all this was yet to be wrought in ourselves; we, too, must be born again; "Christ must be formed *in us*;" we must be "dead with Christ, that we may also live together with Him;" we must be "buried together with Christ by baptism into death, that, like as Christ has risen from the dead, so we also may walk in newness of life," and, being "risen with Christ, we must have our life hid with Him in God;" in a word, "stripping ourselves of the old man with his deeds, we must put on the new, Him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of Him that created him." Such is the language of Holy Scripture concerning the life of the Christian; he must "put on Jesus Christ;" his life must be the life of Jesus Christ in him. And to effect this great change, Christ has instituted certain Sacraments, to be, as it were, the channels whereby the gifts that He has purchased for us by his sufferings and death should be conveyed to the soul, and appropriated by each one of us individually; to be the means whereby, as by an instrument, righteousness should be begun in us, and, being begun, should be confirmed and receive increase, or, if at any time it were lost, should be again recovered.

This is the general aim and purpose of all these ordinances; they are appointed to convey an internal sanctifying power to our souls, to effect our re-union with God, and to establish us in the most intimate communion with Him; but above all, this is the purpose of that which is the crown and consummation of all the other sacraments, we mean, the most holy Sacrament of the altar. For whilst the other sacraments supply remedies, some to one fault or weakness of our nature, some to another, or confer special graces, each suited to some peculiar circumstances of our need, this, on the contrary, contains within itself the source and fountain of all grace, the very Author and Giver of all sacraments, the real corporal Presence of Jesus Christ himself. And hence it is, that this Sacrament has always appropriated to itself some of those names and titles which are really common to them all; and the Church has ever guarded these sacred mysteries with even more than ordi-

nary care and jealousy, watching over them with the warmest and most enthusiastic devotion; sometimes indeed manifesting her love and gratitude (yet at the same time her deep awe and reverence) by one form of outward development, sometimes by another, but ever accounting them as the most costly pearl committed to her keeping, the source of all her treasures, the centre of all her glory. Her preachers, too, have exhausted their powers of eloquence in shewing forth their praises; the learning of her doctors has been spent on declaring their nature and unfolding their hidden properties; her martyrs have suffered death, rather than expose them to the insults and injuries of unbelievers; her saints have been again and again "rapt to the very heaven," and enjoyed a foretaste of blessedness, through their reception, or by their mere contemplation; and all her faithful children, every where and at all times, have triumphed over their enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil, only by virtue of the supernatural strength which was thus imparted to them.

In the following pages, then, we propose to lay before our readers some brief account of whatever is most worthy of observation in this devotion of the Church towards the Holy Eucharist; any notable change of discipline, either in the manner or in the time of partaking of it, or in any other particular intimately connected with its celebration; the origin and history of certain religious observances, or forms of devotion, which are either now, or have been in times past, celebrated in its honour; some of the most remarkable histories which belong to it, either in the way of miraculous appearances, attesting the truth of the doctrine, of judgments attending its profanation, or of special privileges vouchsafed to those favoured servants of God who had exhibited a particular devotion towards it; in a word, of whatever seems calculated to be at once most interesting and most instructive upon this very important subject.

The Communion of the body and blood of Christ, then, being the means whereby fallen man is brought into the most intimate communion and fellowship with his Redeemer, the devotion of the first Christians naturally prompted them to a frequent and even daily participation thereof; for since He had expressly declared that to receive of this food was (for adults) a condition of the resurrection to glory, and to abstain from it was to be without the gift of life, they judged it quite as needful for their souls' health, that they should approach this heavenly banquet day by day, as that they should make the same frequent provision for the support of their mortal

bodies. Moreover, as far as they had been instructed at all as to the frequency with which they should communicate, the same rule had been proposed to them; "Give us this day our daily bread," was a petition which He himself had taught them; and they could not surely err in supposing that in these words there was a direct and special reference to that "super-substantial" bread "which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it, he may not die." As soon, then, as his bodily presence had been removed, and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, had come down, we read that "they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and broke bread from house to house;" and perseverance "in the communication of the breaking of bread" is mentioned as an equally abiding characteristic of their lives, as perseverance in the true faith or in prayer. This habit of daily communion appears to have remained in universal, or at least in general, use during the period of the Church's persecutions; so long as these continued, there was no temptation for any to attach himself to the body of the Church who did not also intend to order his life according to its rules and precepts; and for such as really purposed to do this, to fight manfully as true soldiers of Jesus Christ, and to yield a full and hearty obedience to all the commandments of the Gospel; for such as these, there was an absolute necessity of being continually clothed in this heavenly panoply. "We ask for our daily bread," says St. Cyprian, "and communicate daily, receiving the food of life, lest, falling into some sin, we should be obliged to abstain, and so be cut off from the body of Christ."

But the same causes which rendered it so imperative that the Christians of those days should never go forth to the battle unstrengthened by this supernatural food, made it very difficult, if not impossible, that they should always meet together to receive it. It is true, it had been originally imparted, not to single individuals apart from the rest, but to the whole company of the Apostles assembled at one common meal; and whereas it was a special sacrament of love, knitting us together by closest bonds of communion one with another, and with Christ our head, it was most fitting that men should continue "to come together into one place," as often as they desired to partake of it; nevertheless the circumstances of the times did not permit such frequent assemblies of the faithful: in those days men were forced to screen their religion from the knowledge of their nearest neighbours, or if at any time it became known, to hide themselves and to wander about in deserts, in mountains, in dens and caves of the earth: how could these securely meet together for the daily celebration of the

Christian mysteries? For these reasons, then, the deacons and inferior clergy were appointed to carry portions of the blessed Sacrament to those who had been unavoidably absent, whether because they were sick, or in prison, or from whatever other cause prevented from personally assisting at the sacrifice; and not only so, but even those of the laity who were present, though they communicated, were yet permitted to receive another portion to reserve in their own homes, in case circumstances should hinder their speedy reunion. Thus St. Cyprian* mentions of a woman in his own day, who had committed a great sin by sacrificing at the altars of some of the heathen gods, that she went on one occasion to open the vessel in which she kept the Lord's body, with the intention of communicating herself, but was terrified and prevented from doing so by the flames of fire that issued from it; and Tertullian,† speaking of one whose husband was a pagan, and ignorant of his wife's religion, says that he need not be told what it is which she eats secretly every morning before she tastes any other food; for that even if he should discover that it was bread, still he will not therefore suspect its real nature and properties.

This custom, like so many others both in matters civil and ecclesiastical, was suffered to continue long after the circumstances which gave rise to it had ceased. In the East‡ we find a hermit in the tenth century consulting the Archbishop of Corinth, who had been attracted by the fame of his sanctity to visit him in his own cell, as to what method of communicating ought to be observed by persons such as he was, living apart from the society of men. The Archbishop replied, that they should receive, if possible, from the hands of a priest, as others did; but that if this could not be, they were to put the vessel in which they kept the consecrated species on the altar, if they had a chapel, or, if there were nothing but a mere cell, then upon the cleanest bench they could provide, and unfolding and spreading thereon a cloth to serve for a corporal, they were reverently to place on it the blessed Sacrament itself; next, they should burn incense before it, and sing the Creed, the Sanctus, or certain appropriate Psalms; kneel thrice in humble adoration, and then reverently bringing their hands together, receive it into the mouth and say, Amen; after which, having drunk wine from a cup specially set apart for the purpose, and never profaned by any common uses, they were to gather up all that remained, and to replace it with care into the vessel, taking every precaution that no particle

* De Lapsis.

† Ad Uxor. lib. ii. c. 5.

‡ Acta S. Lucæ junioris, apud Combes. Auct. Bibl. Pat. tom. ii. p. 986.

should fall to the ground. But not only did the practice of private communion remain among those who led solitary lives in the wilderness, and to whom such an indulgence was in a manner necessary, because they could not often approach the ordinary dispensers of God's mysteries: it was retained in the days of Basil,* even among the whole multitude of the faithful in Egypt, especially in Alexandria, not without scandal, however, to some of the weaker brethren, who were ignorant that it had been ever sanctioned by the general usage of the Church. In the West, too, it was not unknown to Rome in the days of St. Jerome;† and it seems to have continued at least to the beginning of the sixth century; and even in the end of the seventh it was necessary for a council‡ to decree that no laic should communicate himself, if a bishop, priest, or deacon could be found instead; and later still, in the twelfth century, it was customary in some places for religious virgins, on the day of their consecration, to receive a host from the hands of the priest, with which they should communicate themselves every day of the following week; and in Rome, when a bishop was consecrated by the Pope, he only consumed a portion of the host which he had received on the day of his consecration, reserving the rest that he might minister it to himself during the next forty days: a peculiarity sometimes observed by priests also immediately after their ordination, and which is said to have had some mystical reference to the forty days of our Lord's sojourn upon earth after his resurrection from the dead.§ Now, however, it has long since disappeared, even as a partial observance, from every branch of the Church: only in one instance it is said to have been revived in later days, in behalf of the unhappy Mary Queen of Scots, to whom, if we may credit the assertions of several of her biographers,|| St. Pius V. mercifully conceded the same privilege, because the cruel malignity of her enemies would not permit the ministers of religion to have access to her. Nevertheless, by means of this indulgence from the Pontiff, and through the kindness of her friends, who found means of providing her with consecrated hosts for the purpose, she was not deprived of that strengthening bread of life which she so much needed. It was only through this same indulgence, as we have said, that the early Christians were able to arm them-

* Epist. 289.

† Epist. 48, ad Pammach.

‡ Conc. Quinisext. can. 58. Labbe, Conc. tom. vii. p. 1374.

§ Alcuin de Div. Off. c. xxxvii. Fulbert, Ep. ad Finard. apud Bibl. Pat. Max. tom. xviii. p. 5.

|| De Vita et Rebus gestis. S. P. Mariæ Scot. Reg. tom. ii. London, 1725, pp. 45, 75, 113.

selves against the many dangers which surrounded them; and the prevalence of such a practice is one of the strongest proofs that could be alleged of the frequency with which they communicated.

‡ The habit of daily communion, however, appears to have gradually relaxed with the decay of primitive fervour, and no uniformity was observed in the degree of frequency admitted in its stead. It is clear, from the language of some of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, that they lived themselves in the habit of daily communion, and that they also administered it daily to some others. At the same time, it cannot be denied but that there was great remissness among Christians generally in this matter, more especially in the Eastern Church. St. Chrysostom complains again and again,* that he stands at the altar, day after day, inviting the people in vain, or that if they come at all, it is only from the force of habit, on the recurrence of stated seasons, such as during Lent, or at Epiphany, or at Easter, or only twice in the year, or even once in two years; and St. Ambrose not obscurely intimates that many of the eastern Greeks had already in his own time learned to communicate but once in a year.† This decline from the zeal of the first ages is painfully marked by the necessity which called for the special enactment of a decree in the beginning of the sixth century that all should communicate at least three times in the year, at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; to which was added in France the feast of the Epiphany, and in Spain that of the Transfiguration. But since this is only the extreme limit of unfrequency, of which if any man fell short he thereby ceased to be a living member of the Church, it furnishes no real clue to the habits of those who strove in earnest to do the will of God, and to save their souls. These, of course, followed a far different rule, of which, though it cannot now be ascertained with accuracy, many traces may be found in the annals of Ecclesiastical History.

Thus, the Council of Paris, A.D. 829, warned the emperor, Louis le Debonnaire, that he was bound to receive as often as he could, in order to excite the rest of the court by his example: St. Peter Damian,‡ A.D. 1062, recommended daily communion as the surest armour and safeguard of chastity, which may be taken as a clear proof that the primitive practice was not then altogether extinct: even in some parts of the Greek Church,§ in the days of Theodre Archbishop

* Hom. in Matt. lii.; in Eph. iii.; in Heb. xvii.

† De Sacram. v. 4.

‡ Annal. Camaldul. lib. xviii. 46, ed. Venet. 1756.

§ Labbe, Concil. tom. viii. p. 23.

of Canterbury, if a man absented himself from communion during three successive Sundays, he incurred the sentence of excommunication; and although the Church of Rome did not enforce frequency of communion by the same awful penalty, yet those of her children who were faithful never failed to partake of the sacred mysteries at least every Sunday. This was prescribed to the monks of the rule of St. Benedict;* and this too was probably the rule introduced into our own country by St. Austin and his Roman companions; for when the Scottish missionaries in the north introduced the practice of confining the privilege to Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter, the venerable Bede addressed an earnest exhortation to Archbishop Egbert that he would cause this abuse to be reformed, for that he knew there were thousands in all ranks of life who ought to communicate every Sunday and holyday, as they did in Rome and other Catholic countries. The second Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 836, required that men should communicate every Sunday, "lest, by withdrawing from the Sacraments (it was said), they should withdraw from salvation." The same thing was recommended by the council assembled at Cloveshoe in the year 747; and when, at a later period, communion three times in the year was required of all, they were still admonished that besides this they ought to draw near to the altar every Sunday in Lent, as well as on the three days before Easter, and every day during its octave. Pope Nicholas the First too, in the middle of the ninth century, recommended the inhabitants of Bulgaria, who had written to consult him on many points of discipline, the practice of daily communion during Lent, and seems to imply that such was the custom in Rome.

It was not till the beginning of the thirteenth century that Pope Innocent the Third reduced the universal obligation of Christians to a single communion in the year, and appointed for this purpose the festival of Easter—a time which had been always especially consecrated to the performance of this duty; so that St. Chrysostom was obliged to rebuke the folly of those who, leading careless lives, and never coming at other times, yet insisted upon coming now, as though it were not the same victim that was always offered, or as though the Sacrament did not confer the same graces to-day, yesterday, and for ever. This decree of the Lateran Council was confirmed by the Fathers assembled at Trent, and continues therefore to rule the practice of the Church in this matter; that is, it is only once in the year that she sends forth to the highways and hedges, and *compels* men to come in, that her

* Annal. Camaldul. lib. xiv. 36.

table may be filled; and though, when the King shall come in to see the guests, it is to be feared that he may find among those who are thus introduced some that have not on a wedding garment, yet the guilt of this must needs lie, not with the Church, but with the individuals themselves, since she is both ready and anxious to clothe them in the fine linen of righteousness, to cleanse the unsightly stains upon their robes by means of the Sacrament of Penance. At the same time, she *daily* prepares her feast, and invites all to a daily participation thereof, saying, "Come, eat my bread, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you;" and not a few are every where to be found responding to the call. St. Charles Borromeo recommended to all the faithful in his diocese that they should communicate at least every Sunday during Lent and Advent, before and after any journey, or any important undertaking, or during the pressure of any anxiety, or as an act of thanksgiving for mercies received; in a word, as frequently as possible.* St. Alphonso Liguori, in his catechetical instructions to the people, does not hesitate to say, "Let all communicate once a week; persons who use mental prayer should communicate still oftener, several times in the week; but others who lead a more tepid life, in order that they may at least preserve themselves in the grace of God, should certainly communicate every Sunday, or, at the very least, once a fortnight." Such is the language of this great master of the spiritual life; and every body who has resided in any really Catholic country knows how faithfully it is reflected in the practice of the people.

Hitherto we have spoken only of the gradual and silent changes in the general practice of Christians with regard to the frequency with which they partake of that heavenly manna, whereof the Church was to give the Lord's family their measure in due season: we come now to a far more troublous history, that of the variations she has introduced into her manner of distributing it. And, first, since circumstances have invested this with a peculiar importance of its own, let us say a few words upon the history of her usage as to the administration of the double species of bread and wine. It is not to be doubted, as the Church has always affirmed, that as the Apostles first received the body and blood of Christ in this twofold form, so it continued for awhile to be distributed, at least under ordinary circumstances; but neither can it be denied, on the other hand, if any trust be ever due to the voice of history in any thing, that she never accounted it in any way essential to the Sacrament, nor hesitated to act

* Acta Eccles. Mediol. tom. i.; Conc. Prov. 4.

otherwise, when she deemed it desirable or convenient. From the very first ages of Christianity, and in every branch of the Church, it was usual to administer the Holy Communion to little infants as soon as they were baptised; and to these, from the mere necessity of the case, because they could not swallow any thing that was solid, the chalice alone conveyed the precious gift.* Yet none ever dreamed that children were thereby made partakers only in some inferior measure of Christ's presence; that something of its infinite fulness was withdrawn or withheld, because the species were thus divided; any more than they apprehended the same impossible evil in cases where the host only was received, and the chalice was absent, as in all those instances we have mentioned of Christians taking it by themselves in their own homes, and, of course, also in the case of sick and dying persons, who could only communicate in that one species in which alone it was commonly reserved. For instance, in a letter of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, preserved to us by Eusebius, we read of one Serapion, who having been a good Christian for many years, fell away in his old age, and sacrificed to heathen gods; this man, being suddenly taken speechless, and remaining in that condition during three days, at length revived a little in the middle of the night, and desired his grandson to run immediately for a priest to bring him the Holy Communion. Dionysius had ordered that this should not be refused to any dying penitents that might desire it; but it so happened that the priest was too ill to obey the call; he therefore gave a small portion of the Eucharist into the hands of the boy himself, and bid him hasten home with it, moisten it in a little water, and so give it to the dying man. Again, Paulinus relates that St. Honoratus, sleeping one night in the same house with St. Ambrose, was warned in a dream to go down and visit him; he arrived just in time to give him the body of his Lord before he died; and St. Basil too, under the same circumstances, received but in one kind a portion of the sacred Host, which he had himself set apart for the purpose some time before; and so in other cases also. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, as we have said, whenever there was occasion to communicate apart from the celebration of Mass, since thus only was it reserved either by the faithful in their own houses at first, or more recently in the public churches. The Greeks can never have communicated in any other way during the greater part of Lent; for they were not in the habit of saying Mass during that season, excepting on Saturday and Sunday; and on all other days they used that which the Roman Church uses only on Good

* St. Aug. c. Julian. ii. 30.

Friday, and which is called *Missa Præsanctificationum*; that is, a Mass in which there is no consecration, but the priest receives a host reserved from the consecration of a previous day.*

All these, it is true, are but occasional variations, as it were, and exceptions to the general practice, occasioned either by the weakness of the recipient, or by the greater facility of reserving the one sacred species rather than the other: still these cases might, of course, be indefinitely extended for other causes, and at any rate they are abundantly sufficient to demonstrate the faith of the Church, that Jesus Christ was as wholly and entirely present under one species as under the other, or as under both; for that since his resurrection his body was one and indivisible; so that, however it might be broken under its sacramental form, distributed and divided throughout the four quarters of the globe, yea, given to every individual inhabitant thereof for the sanctification of his body and soul, it yet remained one and the same every where, complete and unbroken, perfect and entire in all its parts.

“A sumente non concisus,
Non confractus, non divisus,
Integer accipitur.
Sumit unus, sumunt mille,
Quantum isti, tantum ille;
Nec sumptus consumitur.”

It is nothing strange, then, that before the middle of the fifth century, it had become a matter of entire indifference, on which the practice of the people was very much divided, whether even on ordinary and public occasions they communicated in both kinds, or—as we do now—in one only; for we find Pope Leo obliged to enjoin the reception of both, as the only means of detecting the Manichees and separating them from the communion of the faithful. These heretics not holding the true doctrine concerning the Incarnation, did not believe that Jesus had ever had real blood such as belongs to our human flesh; for this they denied that he had assumed; moreover, to drink wine was an abomination to them, because they considered it the work of an evil creation from which they ought carefully to keep themselves apart.† For both these reasons, then, they abstained from the use of the chalice; but because this was done by many others also, it did not expose them to any evil suspicions, and they were able to frequent the assemblies of Catholics, and even to partake with them of the holy Eucharist undetected. It was in order to penetrate this disguise, and to

* Allatius de Consens. Perp. Eccl. Oc. et Or. lib. iii. c. xv. § 6,

† St. Aug. c. Faust. xx. 13.

oblige the heretics to come out from among the orthodox, that Pope Leo issued an order that for the future all persons should communicate in both kinds; and this injunction was repeated yet more strongly fifty years later by Pope Gelasius, in whose time it would appear that even certain priests had begun to offer the holy Sacrifice without wine. This, however, was instantly and decisively checked, whilst communion in one kind, however it may have been abated in particular localities in deference to these decrees and to the presence of heretics, was certainly by no means discontinued. Whether it was from the dread which Christians always had lest any portion of the blessed Sacrament should fall to the ground or be otherwise irreverently handled, of which, of course, there was very imminent risk as often as the chalice was distributed to large multitudes of people; or whether it be true, as some have said, that one of the heresies of Nestorius affirmed the separate and independent existence of the flesh and blood of Christ under the several species of bread and wine, and that the general Council of Ephesus, having condemned this error, recommended communion in one kind as a protest against it; anyhow the fact is certain that, spite of the interference of St. Leo and St. Gelasius, the practice was yet retained. Not long afterwards a custom was introduced of giving the blood to such as continued to receive it, only through a hollow tube or pipe, either of gold, of silver, or of ivory, such as is still used by the Pope and his deacon when the Holy Father celebrates High Mass on some of the principal festivals. But even this method of administering it, when used for a great many, was hardly more safe than the former; and by and by we read that the host was very commonly dipped into the blood, and so both were administered together in a spoon which was inserted into the communicant's mouth, just as the Greek Catholics continue to do at the present day. This was strongly objected to by many in consequence of the recollection which it naturally brought to the mind of that which is written, "He it is to whom I shall reach bread dipped; and when He had dipped the bread, He gave it to Judas Iscariot. And after the morsel, Satan entered into him." However unreasonable this conceit may have been in itself, it was at least natural, and when once entertained in the imagination, not unimportant. This custom, therefore, was never at any time universally received, being condemned in some places, yet allowed in others. It was forbidden in a council in the middle of the seventh century, and again in the Council of Clermont at the end of the eleventh century, "excepting only in cases of necessity and by way of caution;" qualifications which were ex-

plained by Pope Paschal the Second, as referring to the case of children or very sick persons who were not well able to swallow. It was once more condemned in a council held in London in the year 1175; and there can be no doubt but that the strong prejudice so generally entertained against this method of communicating, contributed, in a great measure, to the withdrawal of the chalice altogether, which was first definitely ordered in the Council of Constance, A.D. 1415. It had become common, however, in some parts of the Church long before this, for the fathers who were at that time assembled there distinctly say as much; it is even said that the Church of Poland had never known any other custom, and yet that country had been converted to Christianity ever since the tenth century.

There is extant a most interesting letter of William de Campellis, Bishop of Chalons, a contemporary and intimate friend of St. Bernard, in which he complains of the opposition to the withdrawal of the chalice as heretical, not of the practice itself as novel, and writes most reasonably and temperately upon the whole subject.* “There are many different ways,” he says, “of receiving the holy Eucharist, each having a distinct rationale of its own, but the substance is the same in all; for it is for a mere frivolous cause that it is forbidden to give the host dipped in wine, forsooth because of the dipped sop which our Lord gave to Judas when He wished to distinguish him from the rest; yet there is no real evil in it, and if it be received with faith, it is good. So, again, where each species is received separately, this is done in order to retain more strictly, and more vividly to represent before our eyes, the memory of that body which hung visibly upon the cross, and of that blood mingled with water which flowed forth from his side. Nevertheless it must not be forgotten that he who receives but one species, yet receives the whole of Christ; for in this sacrament Christ is not received limb by limb and little by little, but whole and entire, whether in both species or in either; to little babes, for instance, just baptised, the cup only is given, because they cannot use bread, and in that cup they receive the whole of Christ That, therefore, is plainly heretical, which some persons affirm, saying that it is necessary that both species should be received; for Christ, since his resurrection, is invisible, impassible, and indivisible, so that there can neither be his blood without his flesh, nor his flesh without his blood, nor either without his human soul, nor his human soul without the Word of God, personally united thereunto.” This is precisely as the Catholic

* Mabillon, *Præf. in iii. Sæc. Bened.* § 75.

faith is still ordinarily expressed in the simplest catechisms, that in the Holy Eucharist the body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly present, together with his soul and his divinity.

We see, then, how unreasonable, and how contrary to the mind of the Church, were the fierce and violent proceedings of the heretics in the fifteenth century in this matter. It served as a convenient cloak for other and grosser errors, and for this reason it was invested with a degree of importance which its most boisterous advocates did not really attach to it; for in truth John Hus, to whom this heresy is usually attributed, did not originally put this forward as one of the errors and grievances which he charged on the Catholic Church. But when it was suggested to him by Peter of Dresden (who having been banished from his own city, had fled to Prague), he eagerly adopted it for the show of plausibility which it had, and its apparent scriptural authority, in order that he might divert attention from his more open heresies concerning the other sacraments.* Nor were his disciples slow to betray both their irreverence and the resolute obstinacy of their purpose. Two years after the Council of Constance, having collected a large army, with which they destroyed and plundered many churches and monasteries, they spread three hundred tables in a large open plain, at which they distributed the cup to the ignorant and blood-stained multitudes. They then proceeded to enforce their demands with such increasing violence, that Conrad, the Archbishop of Prague, was at length induced to concede the use of the chalice, as they desired, hoping that he might thus be enabled to bring them back to the unity of the faith; but his hopes were disappointed, and the concession was condemned by the reigning Pope, Martin V. Twenty years afterwards, at the Council of Basle, the use of the chalice was again allowed to the Bohemians and Moravians, provided only that they did not interfere with those who were contented to do otherwise, nor censure the more general practice of the Church, but publicly profess the true faith, that Christ being indivisible was contained alike whole and entire in either species. This condition, however, they were so far from observing, that they even refused Christian burial to those whose practice differed from their own.†

It was still usual at this time, in the Roman Church, to administer the chalice to those who communicated on solemn occasions from the hands of the Pope himself; but now, with

* *Aeneas Sylvius (Pius II.), Hist. Boem. c. 35.*

† *Æn. Sylv. Epist. 130. c. Boem.* See also a letter of G. Pogiebrac, king of Bohemia, to his son-in-law Matthias, king of Hungary, apud Dacher. *Spicil.* iv. 413.

that jealous vigilance for the preservation of the true faith, which had ever been her glorious prerogative, and which has earned her the hatred of all heretics from the time of Tertullian even to the present day, she suspended the exercise of her own privilege for a while; so that, when the Emperor Frederic III. came to visit Pope Paul II. in 1469, it is expressly mentioned as a remarkable peculiarity,* that he partook of the sacrament of the altar with his Holiness, as did also the deacon and subdeacon; but that, contrary to custom; and as a protest against the rising heresy, none of them tasted of the chalice but the Pope only. In the Council of Trent, both the Emperor Ferdinand and Charles IX., king of France, petitioned through their respective legates that the use of the chalice might be restored to the laity. The Council deemed it wiser, however, to confirm the decree of the Council at Constance, at least for the general guidance of the Church, with the express proviso, however, that, if at any time the Pope should think fit, and Christian charity should seem to require it, he might from time to time make special concessions in behalf of particular countries or places, as was actually done for a while by Pius IV. himself in the case of some German bishops, and it was continued for a short time in Vienna. But being unattended by those conciliatory results which had been hoped for, it was afterwards revoked; and the only exceptions which really continued for any length of time were those of the assistants at High Mass in the church of St. Denys, in Paris, in the monastery of Cluny, and some other Benedictine and Cistercian houses in France, for which the right was reserved,† and where the blood was received (as it still is in the High Masses sung by the Pope) through a *canula*, or reed, of gold. Still, since the matter is one of discipline, and not of doctrine, it is clear that the practice of the Church might again be changed; and a modern Catholic writer does not hesitate to say, that “if an universal desire were expressed for the use of the cup with the same love and concord, as from the twelfth century the contrary wish has been enounced, doubtless permission would again be granted to each one to drink or not of the consecrated chalice,” according as his devotion might prompt him.‡

While these changes in the use of the chalice were being gradually established in spite of the opposition of heretics, others had been more peaceably permitted in the manner of administering under one kind. At first it was usual to receive

* Aug. Patric. Sen. apud Mabillon. Mus. Italic. i. 265.

† Bellotte de Rit. Eccl. Laud. Obs. p. 641.

‡ Möhler's Symbolism, i. 353.

with the hands brought together into the shape of a cross, the left hand forming a support on which the other should rest; the host being then placed in the hollow of the right hand was reverently contemplated for awhile, and sometimes raised to the eyes for this purpose, and even kissed; after which it was taken into the mouth by the recipient himself, and so consumed. Sometimes also, before it was consumed, the recipient touched with it his eyes, ears, and other organs of sense, intending thereby to bless and sanctify them. For some time both men and women were wont to communicate in this manner; and there are frequent allusions in the Fathers to the scrupulous care with which they washed their hands on these occasions;* but in a council held towards the end of the sixth century, it was expressly prohibited to women to receive the Blessed Sacrament into their bare hands; they were to provide each a linen napkin or cloth, and to spread it over both their hands, when they came to receive the body of Christ. This at least was the most common practice; but in some places it was considered an act of irreverence towards God's creation to prefer the artificial manufacture of man as a worthy throne for the Son of God, to our own hands which were his handiwork; and accordingly the use of this *linteum*, or *dominicale*, was there prohibited.† It disappeared altogether in the ninth century before the custom of placing the host into the mouth of the communicant immediately, which about that time became universal, having been begun in England and some other places even the century before, or, as some think, as early as the sixth century.‡

Immediately after communion it was usual to take a little wine or water, in order that no consecrated particles might remain about the mouth; only St. Charles Borromeo enjoined that it should not be given either in a consecrated vessel or in a vessel of the same shape with those which were consecrated, lest the people should be deceived into an idea that they were receiving the sacred blood.§ Sometimes, too, especially at Easter, when the number of communicants was so much more numerous, and included many who were weak, eggs were provided, which had been steeped in some medicinal preparation to check any tendency to sickness; for it was an universal rule that the blessed Sacrament should be received fasting.

* St. Aug. c. Parmen. ii. 13. St. Chrys. Hom. in Matt. 52, in Eph. iii.

† Labbæi Conc. tom. vii. p. 1375. Conc. Quinisext. can. 101.

‡ In an old Roman *Ordo*, published by Mabillon (*Mus. Italic. ii. pp. 69, 75*), the priest and deacon received the blessed Sacrament into their own hands, and kissed it before consuming it; but the subdeacon and the people received it into their mouths immediately from the hands of the priest.

§ Acta Med. Eccl. tom. i. p. 8. Conc. Prov. 1.

Upon *this* point the discipline of the Church has been always most stringent. "It is clear, indeed, from the very words of Holy Writ," says St. Augustin, "that the first Apostles received the body and blood of Christ when they were not fasting; yet who shall therefore presume to censure the practice of the whole Catholic Church, which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has ever enjoined that those who receive it should not have broken their fast?" The district of Thebais, or Upper Egypt, presents the only national exception to this rule throughout the whole length and breadth of Catholic Christendom;* and some individuals in some of the churches in Africa esteemed it a more appropriate celebration of Maundy Thursday, if on that day they should be allowed to communicate in the evening after supper; and this desire was so far sanctioned by the Church, that she allowed Mass to be said on that one occasion in the year, both at the usual hour in the morning and also after the hour of dinner, in order that each might have the opportunity of satisfying his own devotion in this particular.† But even this was forbidden in later years; so that, when the son of our own James the Second petitioned the Father of the Faithful that, in consideration of his infirmities, he might be permitted to communicate after having partaken of refreshment, the most diligent search into all the records of antiquity could find but a single precedent for such an indulgence. The bull in which Benedict XIV.‡ at length conceded what was asked "to his very dear son in Christ, James the Third, king of Great Britain," brings together into one place all that could be gathered upon the subject. From it we learn that Pius IV. once granted a brief to Sebastian, king of Portugal, allowing the missionaries in his Indian dominions to celebrate Mass, although from weakness, superinduced by an unhealthy climate, they may have been obliged to take food after midnight; that Innocent the Third once granted a similar permission to some king and queen who had occasion to receive the holy communion in the midst of the long and fatiguing ceremonies of their coronation; and that, by the silent sanction of immemorial custom, without any formal concession, the Cardinal who sings the first mass on Christmas-day in the presence of the Pope, does so after having broken his fast, because, in order that the Cardinals may have time each to say their own three masses before assisting at the pontifical mass in St. Peter's, it is necessary

* Socrates, H. E. v. 22. See also Ratramn. Corb. Mon. c. Græc. Oppos. lib. iv. c. 11, apud Dacher. Spicil. ii. p. 110.

† St. Aug. ad Jan. lib. ii. ep. 54, alias 118.]

‡ Bullarium, tom. ix. 128.

that the first high mass should be celebrated by anticipation on Christmas eve, and the Cardinal, who may very probably be old and infirm, could not possibly sing this mass at eight o'clock in the evening if he had been keeping strict fast ever since the preceding midnight; lastly—and this was the only case which really resembled that of the present petitioner—Julius III. had granted it to Charles V., emperor of Germany, after he had retired into a monastery at Estremadura, that his devotion might not be hindered by his bodily infirmities and age.

Two or three other particulars yet remain to be noticed, and then we shall have mentioned every thing that is necessary to complete the history of what concerns the ordinary method of administering and receiving this holy Sacrament: these are, the place and posture of the recipient, and the person who was allowed to administer it. For the first, we learn from the history of Theodosius and St. Ambrose,* that all the clergy were admitted within the *cancelli*, or enclosure of the altar, when they wished to partake of the holy mysteries, and that in some places, through an over-easy flattery of royalty, the same privilege was extended to the emperor also. Neophytes too—all those who, having only just been healed in the cleansing waters of baptism, still wore the princely robe of innocence—were permitted to communicate in the same place; and in some cities the religious of either sex, as being in a manner separate (like the clergy themselves) from the common multitude, and invested with a sacred character; indeed at one time all the people, laity as well as clergy, were wont in the churches of France to receive at the altar. This, however, was never a very common practice, and was expressly condemned in several provincial councils.†

The blessed Sacrament was first received by the Apostles when they were sitting or reclining at the table of their Lord; and it is probable that the early Christians continued for awhile to receive it in the same manner; but at a very early period, certainly in the days of St. Chrysostom, they seem to have received it standing,‡ just as is now done by the priests or bishops who are themselves celebrating the mass, by the deacon who assists the Pope at high mass, and in the Greek Church by the laity also. In the Latin Church, however, the more humble attitude of kneeling has long been the universal practice of communicants.

As to the minister of this sacrament, there has never been

* Theodoret, H. E. v. 18.

† e. g. Conc. Bracarense, A.D. 563.

‡ See also Euseb. H. E. vii. 9.

any doubt in any part of the Church that none below the order of priesthood could consecrate it: priests, therefore, have been always accounted the most fitting persons, and now, indeed, and for many centuries past, they have been the *only* persons privileged to distribute it. Justin Martyr speaks of the deacons as being employed for this purpose; but Tertullian, on the other hand, says, "We receive only from the hands of the *presidents*"—that is, the priests, who (as Justin, too, says) presided over the assemblies of Christians, and performed the act of consecration.* When St. Laurence was anxious to share the martyrdom of St. Sixtus, St. Ambrose tells us that he entreated him to take this opportunity of trying whether he had chosen a worthy minister to whom to entrust the distribution of the blood of the Lord; thus shewing that in the Latin Church the dispensing of the chalice belonged peculiarly to the deacons;† whilst St. Chrysostom, on the contrary, speaks of this as an exclusive prerogative of the priesthood.‡ Subdeacons and acolytes, or even lay persons, were sometimes employed to carry the blessed Sacrament to the sick; but this was always against the mind and spirit of the Church, was only tolerated as unavoidable under circumstances of necessity, and was at length finally prohibited. It is one of the articles of episcopal inquiry, mentioned by Reginon§ early in the tenth century, whether the priest ever gives the blessed Sacrament to a woman or to any lay person to carry to the sick, "which is a thing unlawful." It had been forbidden by a council held in Paris a hundred years before, and still earlier by a council at Rheims. "It has come to our knowledge," say the Bishops assembled at Rheims, "that certain priests set so little value upon the divine mysteries, that they give the sacred body of the Lord to a layman, or even to a woman, to carry to the sick; and those who are not permitted to enter the sanctuary, nor to draw near to the altar, have the holy of holies committed to them. How horrible and detestable this is, the wisdom of all good people will immediately apprehend: therefore this synod peremptorily forbids the repetition of so rash a presumption, and requires that the priest do, by all means, communicate the sick man himself; and if he do otherwise, he shall be subject to the penalty of degradation." In our own country, however, a council held in London at a much later date, in the year 1138,|| still tolerated the practice in cases of very urgent necessity; whilst a

* Tertull. de Cor. Mil. c. 3. de Orat. in fin. Justin Martyr, Apolog. i. c. 65.
See also Clemens Alex. Strom. lib. i. init.

† See Ben. XIV. Bullar. tom. ix. 114.

§ De Eccl. Disc. lib. i. 120.

‡ St. Chrys. Hom. in Matt. 46.

|| Labb. Conc. tom. xii. 1493.

hundred years later, a provincial council at Oxford scarcely permitted it even to a deacon; and certainly, since the thirteenth century, it has never been allowed to any but to priests to administer the holy Sacrament under *any* circumstances.

A LECTURE AT — COLLEGE, IRELAND.

Dramatis Personæ.

THE RECTOR.

CHARLES SOFTLY, ESQ. M.A. (*Professor of Ethnology and Physical Geography*).

THE PROFESSOR OF GREEK (*a member of the Established Church*).

THE PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY (*an Atheist*).

THE PROFESSOR OF BOTANY (*a Quaker*).

THE PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY (*a Swedenborgian*).

THE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY (*a Presbyterian*).

STUDENTS:	{	DANIEL ISAACS (<i>a Jew</i>).
		PATRICK CALLAGHAN (<i>a Catholic</i>).
		EDWARD WILLIAMS (<i>a Methodist</i>).
		GEORGE BOLDER (<i>an Infidel</i>).
		PETER DODSON (<i>an Atheist</i>).
		CORNELIUS BURKE (<i>a High-Church Anglican</i>).
		JEREMY TARBUTT (<i>a Socinian</i>).

SCENE—*The College Lecture-Room, with a rostrum erected at one end. Students assembling, taking their seats, preparing note-books, and looking at their watches to see how the time goes.*

TARBUTT. Has any body seen this new Professor yet?

DODSON. Oh, yes! I saw him this morning.

TARBUTT. Well, what is he like? They say he is to be conciliator-general, and shew the Papists that it is possible to separate science from religion.

DODSON. What he's to do, I can't say. He certainly looks amiable enough. He has a baldish head, grey hair, fine open forehead, rather ruddy cheeks, dresses unexceptionably, and seems as if he would not like to kill a fly. He's a distinguished man, too, they say, in his own line; and makes it a rule never to quarrel with any body.

TARBUTT. How on earth does he manage that?

DODSON. Oh, he praises every body. To hear him talk,

you'd think all the world was full of mild gentlemen and ladies, spending their days in mutual compliments and pleasant parties.

TARBUTT. But what *is* his line? I don't quite understand what they mean by Ethnology.

DODSON. Why the science of races, to be sure; a sort of physical metaphysics. Ah! here he comes.

[Enter Mr. SOFTLY, accompanied by the other five Professors. The Students cheer faintly; Mr. SOFTLY mounts the rostrum, and bows politely to his audience.]

SOFTLY. Gentlemen,—The science of ethnology is one of the most ennobling studies on which the mind of man can occupy itself. If it be ennobling to study the history and conformations of the lower part of the animal creation, and from the manifold examinations of naturalists in all parts of the globe to create the science of natural history, commonly so called; how much more elevated must be the contemplation of what I may term the natural history of the human species! If it be delightful to contemplate the relics of past ages, to reanimate in imagination the vast bones of the mighty Saurian reptiles, to classify animalculæ, and to trace the interesting ties by which the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms are linked together, so as to be able to point out every minute gradation between the primary strata of the earth and the most perfect of the irrational animals who walk upon it; how much more satisfying, I say, must it be to study the ethnological peculiarities of that most noble of all animals, to whose order it is our privilege to belong,—the race of man himself!

One great difficulty, indeed, presents itself in the commencement of our ethnological studies. The vital principle which reigns through so many other parts of the creation—(I beg pardon of the Professor of Moral Philosophy, and of any other gentleman here present who may object to the term “creation,” as implying the existence of a Creator) [*Applause*—this vital principle in the case of man assumes a very peculiar and composite form, and possibly influences the varieties in the human race to an extent far greater than in the case of the lower animals. On the real nature of the animating principle of man, you are well aware that many differences of opinion unhappily exist. I call it “the animating principle” with a view to avoid the use of the much-vexed term, “the soul;” a term to which some of my brother Professors, and some of my hearers, attach a different meaning from

myself. And here I would take occasion to request my audience, that if at any time I should unfortunately use terms to which they may conscientiously object, they will be good enough to signify the same, of course as decorously as possible; or if I should make any statements which may hurt their religious or non-religious convictions, I trust that they will not hesitate to request an explanation, in order that our studies may proceed with perfect harmony, and we may shew to a bigoted world that it is possible for enlightened men of all creeds to act together in the glorious work of the education of the mind.

[*Loud applause, except from CALLAGHAN the Catholic, and BURKE the Anglican Student, who look very angry. As soon as the applause has subsided, BOLDER the Infidel Student jumps up.*]

BOLDER. I beg to apologise for the interruption, sir, but I must avail myself of your permission to ask a question.

[*All eyes are turned to BOLDER, the Students looking astonished, the five Professors disgusted.*]

SOFTLY. By all means; what is it?

BOLDER. I heard it stated, sir, by the Professor of Botany, that it was of the first importance, in all sciences, accurately to define the terms employed. Now you just used the term "mind." May I ask for an explanation of the sense in which you employ that term?

[*BOLDER sits down.*]

SOFTLY. Your request is but reasonable. The word "mind" is susceptible of various meanings. By some it is used in a sense nearly the same as that of the still more questionable term "the soul;" by others it is taken to mean the intellectual faculties; by others, again, it is used to represent the action of the organised material agency, of which they consider the vital principle to consist; by a fourth party, again, it is taken to signify a fragment of a vast and mighty *anima mundi*; by a fifth—

BURKE (*the Anglican*). But how do you use it, sir?

SOFTLY. That, my good young friend, must depend upon circumstances.

CALLAGHAN (*whispering to his next-door neighbour*). What a humbug the man is!

SOFTLY (*continuing*). On the whole, it may be best to leave every one present to employ the term in his own sense. [*Applause, with a few murmurs.*] Whether, then, we look upon the mind of man as immortal and spiritual, or as mortal and material, or as a portion of the Deity, or as naturally corrupt, or as naturally pure, we may safely proceed in our study of the

varieties of the corporeal forms in which it is clothed in the various races of mankind.

DODSON (*the Atheist*). Sir, I beg an explanation. I do not see how it can be of no consequence to assume that the mind or soul, or whatever it is called, is really a separate part of the body, when the most recent scientific researches shew that it is a mere part of the organised material whole. Will you be good enough to state whether you assume that the soul is, or is not, a part of the body?

[*Loud cries of "Hear! hear!" from the Students, while the Professors whisper together, and seem puzzled and annoyed.*]

SOFTLY. Really, Mr. Dodson, I do not see how *you* have any right to assume that *your* view on the subject is correct. Many excellent persons believe that the soul is distinct from the body, and I confess I rather lean to that view myself. But as I abstain from pressing my theories on others, so I must be allowed to think that your request can scarcely be complied with. [*Applause and murmurs, in the midst of which DODSON exclaims, "The man's a coward, after all!" and sits down.*] To resume. Whatever, then, be the nature of the soul, we must be content, in that spirit of humility so befitting the man of science, to leave the subject in that obscurity in which it has hitherto been destined to remain,—

CALLAGHAN and BURKE (*together*). Oh!

SOFTLY. In which it has hitherto been destined to remain; and we must employ ourselves in examining those outward phenomena which are tangible to the senses, and about which there can be no differences of opinion. Matter is, we know, ever governed by uniform laws; and we cannot err, therefore, if, in inquiring into the causes which have operated in producing, or carrying on, the many varieties in the human species, we confine our attention to the known agencies of matter, such as climate, diet, habits of life, civilisation, and so forth. Whatever be the nature of the mind, or animating principle, it has no direct power upon the material world, save in accordance with the known laws of physical and mathematical science.

CALLAGHAN (*the Catholic Student, starting up*). That is contrary to Catholic doctrine. I appeal to the Rector.

THE RECTOR (*who has just entered and taken his place among the Professors*). What is this, Mr. Callaghan? such interruptions are very unseemly.

CALLAGHAN. Mr. Softly, sir, requested us to speak when he hurt our religious feelings; and I came here with the express understanding that my religion was not to be insulted.

THE RECTOR. Insulted! Mr. Callaghan; of course not. Mr. Softly is the last person to insult any man's creed.

CALLAGHAN. Whether it is an insult or not, sir, he has declared that one of the doctrines of Catholicism is false. I submit that it is contrary to the rules of this College to state that *any* religious doctrine is false.

SOFTLY. Mr. Callaghan, you surely misunderstood me. What doctrine of yours did I say was false?

CALLAGHAN. The doctrine of transubstantiation, sir.

[*Cries of "Oh! oh!" from all parts of the Lecture-room.*]

SOFTLY. The doctrine of transubstantiation!

CALLAGHAN. Yes, sir, you said that the mind has no power on the material world, except in accordance with the laws of physical and mathematical science. Surely you must be aware that the Catholic faith says the very opposite, and declares that the priest by the words of consecration actually destroys the original substance of the bread and wine.

SOFTLY (*in his mildest tones*). Mr. Callaghan, that is a question of faith, not of science. Faith is one thing, and science is another. [*Loud applause.*]

CALLAGHAN. But if science contradicts faith, one of the two must be false.

THE RECTOR (*seeming confused*). Mr. Callaghan, may they not be like parallel lines, and run side by side, without meeting?

CALLAGHAN. They *may*, sir, of course; and so they do, very often. But they do not always go parallel, at least so Mr. Softly assumes, for he declared an opinion to be scientifically true, which I know to be, as a matter of faith, false. I submit that this is contrary to the rules of — College.

BURKE (*aside to TARBUTT*). What a plucky fellow Callaghan is! How the deuce came he here! The place will be too hot to hold him.

TARBUTT. Don't you know? His governor makes him come against his will. He hates the college himself, and belongs to the M'Hale faction. He'll bully the professors out of their lives, unless they get rid of him.

BURKE. Well, I wish him success; for I don't half like the place myself.

TARBUTT (*laughing*). Ah! you're a Puseyite, and more than half a Papist.

SOFTLY (*turning to the Professors*). Perhaps I had better withdraw the statement.

THE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY and THE PROFESSOR OF BOTANY (*together, in a low voice*). No, no! that will never

do. The interests of science absolutely forbid it. Tell him you'll speak to him after the lecture.

SOFTLY. Mr. Callaghan, this is a very delicate question. If you will do me the favour to call on me after the lecture is over, I shall trust to explain all to your satisfaction.—Gentlemen, we will now proceed with our subject.

Ethnology, as I have said, is one of the noblest as it is one of the most certain of modern sciences. Whatever be the results of the investigations of the present and coming generations as to the origin of the race of man; whether, as some think, we are all descended from a single pair; or as others, that man started into being in different parts of the globe; whether or no we believe that his present physical structure is the result of ages and ages of the gradual *perfectionnement* (as the French say) of the animal kingdom; whatever, I say, be our theories as to what took place before the commencement of authentic history, in the mythical ages of our race —

WILLIAMS (*the Methodist Student*). I appeal to the Professor of History. Is it permissible to assume that it is not an historical fact, that the human race sprang from a single pair?

THE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY. Mr. Williams, I am not the proper person to appeal to; but if you ask my opinion, I admit that I consider it an historical fact that we all spring from Adam and Eve; but it is only my private opinion: I cannot enforce it on any one else. [*Applause.*]

WILLIAMS. But, sir, it is a part of my religion that all mankind are corrupt by nature, and alienated from God. Now how am I to believe this, if you do away with the historical fact that Adam was the first man, and that he sinned, so that we inherit his guilt and his fallen nature?

[*Loud applause from CALLAGHAN and BURKE.*]

THE RECTOR. Gentlemen, I must request you to be more moderate in your demonstrations.

SOFTLY. Mr. Williams, you must learn to discriminate. I never said that mankind do *not* spring from a single pair; I only said, whether it be true or not, which is a very different thing.

WILLIAMS. Begging your pardon, sir, I don't see the difference when religious faith is concerned. If you say it is *not certain* that Adam was our first parent, you deny a great doctrine of the Gospel; for the Gospel says it *is* certain. I beg that my religious convictions may be respected as well as those of any one else.

SOFTLY (*aside*). Oh, dear! oh, dear! what a pest this bigotry is! I had hoped there was none of it here. (*Aloud.*)

I shall be happy to have some private conversation with you, Mr. Williams, on the subject you allude to. It is unquestionably very important and interesting. In the meantime, perhaps it may be better to pass over the point just now; and I will therefore proceed without further reference to it. We shall doubtless all agree the moment we come down to the ethnological peculiarities of our species as they are found existing at the present moment. Here, at least, we cannot differ, for the facts are evident before the eyes of all. I shall therefore request your attention to a rapid survey of the chief physical causes which tend to modify the bodily structure and the intellectual development of the great races of the four quarters of the globe. Among these, the first, and possibly the most potent in its influence, is climate. Here, nevertheless, many anomalous circumstances combine to render our investigation difficult. While in one instance we perceive the effect of climate to be extraordinarily speedy in changing the physical and moral characteristics of an emigrant race, in others it appears as though centuries were necessary to effect any fundamental change. The Anglo-Saxon, when settled in certain parts of North America, needs but two or three generations to lose every peculiarity of his northern extraction; while the pure negro blood has never yet, under any circumstances, become assimilated with the European or Asiatic type. In combination with such extreme cases as these, we have to contemplate the phenomena presented by certain distinct races, who have spread themselves nearly throughout the world, and who in every climate and age preserve their original type almost untouched. Such are the Jews and the Gipsies, who are still separated from the rest of the world by very striking features, and who, under the influence of certain traditions, each refuse to intermarry with the races among whom they dwell.

DANIEL ISAACS (*the Jewish Student*). Sir, I avail myself of your permission, to interrupt you.

SOFTLY (*aside*). What scrape have I got into now? I thought the Jews at any rate were rational. (*Aloud.*) By all means. What can I explain?

ISAACS. Sir, I object to having the traditions of the Jewish religion classed with those of the Gipsies. The Hebrew race, the chosen people, though now in adversity and bondage, are not to be ranked with a brood of vagabonds like the Gipsies. Our traditions are inspired prophecies; and I claim my right, as a student of this liberal institution, to have my religion respected.

[*All appear astonished, and remain silent.* Mr. SOFTLY

looks at his brother Professors, who elevate their eyebrows and shrug their shoulders, but say nothing.]

SOFTLY (*with a sigh*). I assure you, Mr. Isaacs, that I had not the most remote intention of classing the divine poems of the Old Testament with the wild traditions of any vagabond race.

DODSON (*the Atheist Student*). I am sorry to interrupt you again, sir; but may I ask in what sense you use the word "divine" as applied to the poems of the Old Testament—a term itself, by the way, very much open to objection? I do not see why the poems of David and Isaiah should be called a "Testament" any more than the poems of Homer or Sophocles. I decidedly object to any term which necessarily implies the existence of a God.

[General murmurs and confusion, except from CALLAGHAN, who laughs uproariously, and claps his hands.]

SOFTLY (*to the RECTOR*). This seems a difficulty, sir; is it not? What do you recommend?

THE RECTOR (*after a long pause*). I am deeply grieved, gentlemen, that any speculative questions should ever occur to mar the harmony of our instructions. I am sure that Mr. Softly would not willingly hurt the feelings of any student here; but if he should use any questionable expression inadvertently, I appeal to your kindness whether it is not better to pass it over for the sake of the great cause in which we are all so happily embarked.

[Slight applause, chiefly from the Socinian students.]

THE PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY (*coming forward*). I should entirely agree with you, Mr. Rector, but for the strong conviction I entertain of the necessity of preserving the principle of this seminary inviolate. Its leading principle is this, that in all public instruction there shall be no inculcation of any religious creed. Hence it is evident that no professor ought ever to assert that there is a God, or call any thing "divine," as he would thereby assume that there *is* a God, an assumption strictly forbidden by the rules of this College. Of course, I am not expressing any opinion of my own as to whether there is a God or not. I am only anxious to uphold the rights of the human mind as guaranteed to the students of this noble institution.

THE RECTOR. Undoubtedly you are r'g't, Mr. Professor; and it is my duty, therefore, to suggest to Mr. Softly that he withdraw the term "divine" as applied to the ancient Jewish writings.

SOFTLY (*bowing to the RECTOR*). I withdraw the designation.

CALLAGHAN (*with a loud voice*). Well! I can stand this no longer! The curse of God and St. Patrick be upon this place for evermore! [*Tremendous sensation and confusion.*]

THE RECTOR. Mr. Callaghan, are you aware that you are a student of this College?

CALLAGHAN. Yes, sir, I am aware of it. I came here because my father insisted on my coming; but I will stay no more. He never knew what the College really was; he thought that at least there would be no Atheism and infidelity; but I shall tell him what I have heard to-day. And now I shall not stay another moment to hear you talk about the God that made you as you'd hardly talk about the old Pagan Jupiter and Juno. I shake off the dust from my shoes upon you; and mark my words, the curse of Jesus Christ and St. Patrick will be on you and all your doings!

[*Great uproar, amidst which CALLAGHAN leaves the Lecture-room, some of the Students hissing and groaning, some applauding, and some terrified. SOFTLY declares it impossible to proceed with his lecture; the Professors and Students gather in groups and discuss what has happened. By and by they depart, and the RECTOR prepares to write to the Lord-Lieutenant, to tell him that between the Catholics and the Atheists he finds it impossible to observe the statutes of — College.*]

STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

IN the history of the English Church after the Conquest we shall see concessions which *before* the Conquest had been made by the Church to the Crown when it was worn by saints, abused by sovereigns very much the reverse of saints. These concessions, as we have seen, had sown the seeds of a system of corruption which began to generate in the time of the Confessor, and ripened into rank luxuriance under the dynasty of the Conqueror. A historian writing of the time just preceding the Conquest says:

“After having received the faith of Christ, the English neglected their warlike exercises: their kings changing their habits, some at Rome, some in their own country, striving for a celestial kingdom, sought the eternal in exchange for the temporal one; and many founded churches and monas-

teries, bestowed money on the poor, and fulfilled all the works of charity. The island was so full of martyrs, confessors, and holy virgins, that scarcely a village could be passed in which the name of some new saint was not heard of: but after a while, *charity* beginning to cool, the golden age was turned into the age of clay, and they gave up the pursuit of religion." "The clergy were ignorant, and all classes were given to drinking."*

And *then*, and not till *then*, we read of the crown giving bishoprics, and bishops holding several sees, and sometimes buying them; all which was neither in accordance with the law of the Church, nor with the law of the land, but was unhappily in accordance with the law of *human nature*.

The Conqueror at his accession guaranteed this common law to the Saxons (who declared that "under it they had been born"); and he recognised its principle in his own acts. Thus we read that he consented that causes ecclesiastical should be considered, not by the bishops sitting in the Hundred Court along with the earls, but by the bishops in their own courts. So we read that the Pope directed to him a bull, empowering Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury, as papal legate, to decide disputes which had arisen between the Archbishop of York and Bishop of Dorchester, and running in these terms:

"We have so fully committed to him the authority of *our pontifical power*, as considering and settling causes, that whatsoever he shall according to justice have determined shall be regarded as indissoluble as though it had been adjudged in our presence."

And the king received this bull and permitted it to be acted upon. So also we read that he refused to be consecrated by Stigand, the primate, because "he was not canonically archbishop," and had not received the pall. And again we read:

"It was determined, *according to the decrees of the canons*, that the bishops should quit the villages, and fix their abode in the cities of their dioceses."†

No king knew better how to draw the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal, when it *suit*ed him to do so; as when he arrested Odo, "not as bishop, but as baron;" just as a subsequent monarch sent a bishop's coat of mail to the Pope, and asked, "Is this thy son's coat?" But it did not always suit these Norman monarchs to draw this distinction;

* William of Malmesbury.

† William of Malmesbury, A.D. 1072. It is added, "Selsey therefore migrated, to Chichester, Helmham to Norwich, Sherborne to Salisbury, Dorchester (in Oxfordshire) to Lincoln."

or "at least to adhere to it when it stood in their way;" and although the first two or three never *professed* to have any concern with the spiritualities, yet in their eagerness to seize on the temporalities, they did not shew much regard for the spiritualities. Thus we read, that

"King William, by evil counsel, despoiled the monasteries of their gold and silver, and what was a greater insult to holy Church, he did not even spare the chalices or sepulchral ornaments. He also placed under military rule all bishoprics and abbacies which held baronies; and which, up to that time, had been free from all secular authority; enrolling at his own pleasure each of the bishoprics, and as to how many soldiers each should furnish in time of war, and placing the enrolments of this ecclesiastical slavery in his treasury, he drove from his kingdom many who resisted this most evil decree."*

The temporal treasures of the Church it was which tempted equally the rapacity of the monarch and the cupidity of the bishops. We read soon after, in the same historian:

"At this time Wachare Bishop of Durham, with no regard to the pontifical dignity, busied himself with secular affairs, and purchased from the king the county of Northumberland, and presided at lay tribunals, performing the office of lieutenant, and extorted endless sums of money."

How can we be surprised that we should read, about the same time:

"The king gave bishoprics to his chaplains."

Or, as it is more fully stated by William of Malmesbury,

"The sacred honours of the Church, as the pastors died, were exposed to sale; for whenever the death of any bishop or abbot was announced, directly one of the king's clerks was admitted, who made an inventory of every thing, and carried all future rents into the royal exchequer. In the mean time some person was sought out fit to supply the place of the deceased; not from proof of morals but of money; and at last the empty honour (if I may so say) was conferred, and even that purchased at a great price. These things appeared the more disgraceful, because in his father's time, after the decease of a bishop or abbot, all rents were reserved entire to be given up to the succeeding pastor; and persons truly meritorious on account of religion were admitted. But in the course of a few years every thing was changed."

Whatever be said of the Conqueror must of course be taken *cum grano*; still it is clear that he was moderate and conscientious compared with William II.; and the latter part of

* Roger de Wendover.

the passage significantly indicates the constantly progressive system of encroachment and aggression on the part of the crown, growing bolder and bolder as each successive step was taken and acquiesced in by the Church. The corruptions of the Church and the encroachments of the crown constantly kept pace together. In the next reign the rapacious aggressions of the king surpass those of his father.

“When the venerable Lanfranc was dead, the king kept in his possession almost all the churches and monasteries of England; when their pastors were dead, and plundering every thing he could lay his hands on, let them out to laymen to farm.”

Some time afterwards we find in Roger de Wendover: “William being in fear of death from disease, promised to give peace to the Church; wherefore he gave the archbishopric of Canterbury to the venerable Anselm, and the bishopric of Lincoln to his chancellor. But no sooner did he recover, than he was worse than he was before; for he *regretted that he had not sold the bishopric of Lincoln.*”

Here we have first St. Anselm on the scene, who fills a place in the history of the English Church at this era, scarcely second to that of St. Thomas, of whom he was probably the model, as he was the predecessor and the precursor. We read soon after in the same historian:

“The king demanded of Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury the sum of 1000*l.*, because he had admitted him so readily to the archbishopric. But Anselm thinking that he could not pay the money either before or after his promotion without injury to his conscience, chose rather to incur the king’s displeasure. And that he might do his duty faithfully to the Church, he asked the king’s leave to go and receive the pall from Pope Urban. The king was violently incensed; and certain of the bishops refused to render to the Archbishop the obedience which was his due; and all except Sundulf Bishop of Rochester consented to the madness of the king, and shewed themselves to be dumb dogs that did not dare to bark. The king therefore threatened the Archbishop with his displeasure, and informed him that there was no other mode of regaining his favour than by protesting with an oath that he would not obey the order of Pope Urban. But a few days after there came the pall: Anselm again, however, having received it, asked the king’s license to visit the Pope; and received this answer, that if he would swear that he would not visit the threshold of the Apostles, *nor appeal to the Roman See for any excuse whatever, he might retain his position as the first noble in the land*: if not, he might take his journey, never to return.

The Archbishop, on leaving the council, went to Canterbury, and then embarked at Dover. When he was gone, the public apparitors confiscated to the king's use all his goods, and also the goods of his see, and *declared void all his acts* during his prelacy."

So general was the corruption of the Church, that it might be said of St. Anselm, like Abdiel (with one exception), "among the faithless, faithful only he." And the description of his contest with the Crown (interrupted by the king's death, and renewed again in the reign of Henry I.), exactly resembles, as will be seen, that of St. Thomas with Henry II.; and the history of these contests really appear identical in substance with what took place under Henry VIII.; except, indeed, that then the contest was one in which the Crown triumphed. It was only by accident that St. Anselm escaped the martyrdom which St. Thomas obtained from the second Henry, and the saintly Fisher from the eighth. There is a painful interest in tracing at this early period, in the history of the Anglo-Norman Church, the commencement of that sad drama of corruption in the Church, and encroachment of the Crown, which was consummated at the Reformation in the prostration of the Church, and was ere long followed by as absolute a prostration of the Crown.

Recurring, however, to the reign of William I., we read in William of Malmesbury: "At this time sees were transferred from their ancient situations, Wells to Bath by John; Chester to Coventry by Robert; Thetford to Norwich by Herbert; *all through greater ambition* than ought to have influenced men of such station. Herbert *purchased* the bishopric of Thetford, while his father was intruded on the abbey of Winchester. This man was the great source of simony in England; having craftily procured, by means of his wealth, both an abbey and a bishopric. For he hoodwinked the king's solicitude for the Church by her money, and whispered great promises to secure the favour of the nobility."*

And again, in the same historian:

"John was Bishop of Wells. He had been a *physician*; and on the death of the abbot of Bath easily obtained the abbey from the king; because all *things at court were exposed to sale*."

But things in the Church must have been so as well, else

* It is added, "future repentance, however, atoned for the errors of his youth; he went to Rome, and there resigned the staff and ring which he had acquired by simony, and had them restored through the indulgence of that most merciful see." This is one of innumerable instances in which it is seen how the Holy See was as much a resort for penitents as the centre of authority and the keystone of discipline.

how could John the physician have become John the priest? The ordination and consecration must have been purchased as well as the presentment. Under such a system, the reader will be prepared to hear that

“The king, on the day of his death, held to *his own use* the archbishopric of Canterbury, the bishoprics of Winchester and Salisbury, besides twelve abbacies, which he either sold or let out to farm, or kept in his own hands.”*

Passing next to the reign of Henry I., we find him at his accession solemnly declaring: “I restore the laws of King Edward (the Confessor); I will set free the Church of God; so that I will not make it subject to sale, nor let it out to farm; nor when an archbishop, or bishop, or abbot is dead, will I receive any thing from the domain of the Church, until a successor is appointed to it.”

Once for all we may as well say that there is a similar solemn engagement in all the charters granted by our Plantagenet monarchs from Henry I. to Henry III.; and that (as the reader will see) the engagements were violated by them all. Under Henry I. the same system continued as under William II. The very first thing we read is:

“King Henry gave the bishopric of Winchester to William Gifford, and immediately invested him with all the possessions belonging to the see.”†

This is the practice of investiture already alluded to, and as to which a contest soon arose.

“Anselm Archbishop of Canterbury (having returned to England) held a council at London: at this synod he put forth what had been decreed in a general council at Rome concerning the investiture of churches: viz. that no prelate of a church, bishop, abbot, or clerk, should receive investiture of any ecclesiastical dignity from the hands of a layman; and he degraded certain abbots who had obtained their rank from lay hands, and by purchase; and would not consecrate certain bishops who had received institution from the king. And the Bishop of Hereford, who had done so, surrendered back his bishopric to him. . . . The Archbishop, after having received much tribulation and injuries from the king, proceeded to Rome. Next year the Archbishop was by the king forbidden to return, unless he would observe the former usage; and the king, finding the Pope and Archbishop inflexible, took the archbishopric into his own hands, and confiscated all Anselm's goods.”

It has already been seen that the practice of royal investiture by delivery of the ring and crosier was an encroachment

* Roger de Wendover.

† Ibid.

on the Church by reason of corruption in the Church; as it could only have been through attributing greater importance to the *temporalities* than to the *episcopate* itself, that the symbols of the latter should have been allowed to be conferred by the Crown as the signs of the former; and it has been shewn that they *were* originally only conferred as the signs of the temporalities. And so long as neither the Church was not corrupt, and the Crown not inclined to encroach, the usage gave rise to no very observable practical evil. But under the system which has been described, it can easily be conceived that the evil was utterly unendurable, and threatened entirely to destroy the purity and integrity of the episcopate; the Crown having encroached a part, giving the symbols of the spiritual as the sign of the temporal; next, claiming under cover of that dubious ceremony nomination to the episcopate; and at last claiming entire *dominion* over it. Pope Paschal therefore, in requiring that the Church should confer the cross and ring (just as the Church, by her head, conferred the pall), consenting at the same time that the bishops should do homage to the Crown for their temporalities, was only doing away with an abuse; reverting to the former practice, and restoring the original distinction between the spiritual and the temporal. The Pope writes thus:

“If we prohibit investitures to be conferred by your majesty, we obtain no *increase of patronage* over the churches.”
 “If a lay hand present *the staff, the sign of the shepherd’s office, or the ring, the emblem of faith*, what have the bishops to do in the Church?”*

And we find that the king ultimately “yielded up the investiture of the ring and staff, reserving only the privilege of nomination, and the temporalities.” Eadmer states the contest thus, that the Archbishop asserted against the king “freedom of canonical election;” and this was the point practically at issue: whether the Crown should absolutely appoint to the episcopate.

What was restored by the Crown was only, as the writer has shewn† in the pamphlet already alluded to, in conformity with the law of the land, as much so as with Catholic faith. But neither the law nor the faith restrained those abuses which arose from the corruption of the English Church itself; and which continued to encourage fresh encroachments on the part of the Crown. Very much the same system still continues in practice. So we read:

“The king gave to Simon the *queen’s clerk* the bishopric

* William of Malmesbury.

† See the instances cited in the *Catholic Hierarchy Vindicated*. Dolman.

of Winchester, to John, archdeacon of Canterbury, that of Rochester, and to Sifred, abbot of Glastonbury, that of Chester."

This language of itself indicates an almost entire oblivion of the *spiritual*; for the king did *not* now "give the bishopric," unless by that be understood the *temporalities* of the see, and not the episcopate itself. The king's was only a *nomination* (although it was usually attended to), and the Pope had power of rejection or of appointment paramount to the clergy's right of election or the king's claim of nomination,—a power not unfrequently exercised.

Henry II., on his accession, solemnly guaranteed to the Church, as Henry I. had done before, freedom of canonical election. And we read :

"The clergy and people of the province of Canterbury assembled at Westminster, where Thomas, the king's chancellor, was solemnly elected, without opposition, to be archbishop."*

And here commences the important part of the history of St. Thomas of Canterbury; and it is very important to note, how almost *immediately*, just as in the case of St. Anselm (so utterly antagonistic are the spiritual and temporal—the Church and the State), the conscientious prelate was brought into conflict with the crown :

"He now *renounced all secular cases, and attended only to the spiritual concerns of the Church and the gain of souls*. He resigned the chancellorship; and this act sank deep into the mind of the king, and was the first occasion on which his feelings were ruffled towards Thomas."†

Soon after we read in the same historian :

"Another occasion of offence with the Archbishop arose when the Archbishop bestowed the vacant church of Eynsford on one Laurence; but William, the lord of the village, and tenant *in capite*, claimed the *patronage* of the church, and expelled Laurence, for which he was excommunicated by the Archbishop, which, as it was without *consulting the king* (!) offended him much; for he claimed, as one of his royal dignities, that no tenant *in capite* (*i. e.* of the Crown), nor any of his ministers, should be excommunicated without his privity, lest he might communicate unconsciously with an excommunicated person, or admit him to his council."

And we are informed by Matthew of Paris that the king sent to the Archbishop, ordering him to absolve William de Eynsford; to which the Archbishop answered, that it was in his power alone to judge whom he should excommunicate or absolve. Now this case is the earliest we meet with of a long

* Wendover.

† Ibid.

series of quarrels between the Church and the Crown, all very much of the same character and cause, cases in which some claim of patronage on the part of the Crown came into conflict with rights of the Church; and the Church vindicated the violation of those rights by her great spiritual weapon, *excommunication*. This sentence of course involved, as well according to the law of the State as of the Church, inconvenient consequences; and it was natural that the Crown and its dependents should seek to evade them. It is of importance to observe by what slow and successive steps this was attempted. First, we find in the Saxon law that the bishops alone had absolute authority as to excommunication; and this law had been solemnly sanctioned by every monarch since the Conqueror succeeded the Confessor, and especially by Henry I. and Henry II., so that St. Thomas was as right by the law of the land as by the law of the Church, in rejecting the insolent demand of the king. But we find, from Matthew of Paris, that under the Conqueror this claim had first been put forth on the part of the Crown, though not, it should appear, with much force or effect. Under Henry II. we find it urged rather than enforced, as "one of the royal dignities;" by which, it seems, was meant no more than some privilege rather than a prerogative,—a usage of courtesy to the royal dignity. And very likely, under some of St. Thomas's courtly predecessors, such an usage had grown up; although it is clear it cannot have been a right, since no mention is made of it in the law, nor is the claim even now enforced by the king, however deeply he was incensed against the Archbishop for disregarding it. But the whole claim, after all, it is to be observed, is (at least ostensibly), that the Crown should have *notice* of the excommunication, to which alone the plausible reason assigned for the claim applies. Still, the making this notice a sort of condition to the excommunication implied a disposition in the Crown (which we shall find ere long manifested most decisively) to advance a step further, and go from *notice* to *consent*. It is most important to note this case; it is the first in which *avowedly* the Crown seeks to control the Church in what is *purely spiritual*; and the case moreover contains in itself the germ of the long series of judicial decisions, partly upon and partly in anticipation of those statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors*, which have acquired such a marked place in our legal and ecclesiastical history, and proved what they were never meant to be, the precursors of a national schism, the establishment of a heresy, and the entire subversion of the Church Catholic under the absolute tyranny of the Crown and the secular power. The statutes of the Reformation were anticipated, indeed, by the

constitutions of Clarendon, of which some of the most important clauses had clearly an especial reference to such cases as that of Eynsford.

"If any man belonging to a city, castle, borough, or king's royal manor" (it will be noted how the claim has expanded,) "be summoned by the archdeacon or bishop to answer for a crime, and shall not comply with the summons, it shall be lawful to place him under an interdict, *but not to excommunicate him until the king's principal officer of that place be informed thereof (!)*. None who holds of the king in chief, nor any of his domestics, shall be excommunicated, or put under an interdict, *until the king shall be consulted.*"

It is surely needless to note how utterly audacious and unwarrantable are these claims to subject the spiritual powers of the Church to the arbitrary will of the Crown; and hardly more necessary is it to point out how gradually the encroachment creeps on. At first there is no doubt—indeed, it is in effect stated, that the Conqueror only claimed a custom which he found established, and which had been conceded in courtesy to his saintly predecessor the Confessor, of giving notice to the king when any of his chief servants were about to be excommunicated. The Conqueror claims it as a custom. His successors extend it into a right, and seek to stretch it to a tyranny. And a similar process of encroachment can be clearly detected in every other instance of those enumerated in the constitutions of Clarendon. For example:

"The archbishops, bishops, and all other persons of the kingdom, who hold of the king in chief, shall hold the possessions of the king as barons, and answer to the same to the king's justices and officers, and follow and *observe all the king's customs and rights, like other barons.*" The gist of this claim, it is clear, was to do away with all privileges of the Church, under the plausible pretence of her temporal possessions, and to place her prelates under the feudal dominion of the Crown, like other barons, compelling them to observe all "the king's customs and rights;" *i. e.* all those things which had been originally conceded to the Crown as courtesies, and had then passed into *customs*, and lastly were claimed as rights,—a sufficient specimen of which the other article, illustrated by the Eynsford case, sufficiently presents; *i. e.* claims of complete control over the *spiritual* under pretext of the temporal. So, again, another specimen of *the king's* customs and rights is afforded in the article, which has in it the germ of the acts of supremacy, and the absolute appointment of the episcopate by the sovereign, under the mockery and the mask of a *congé d'elire*.

“When an archbishopric, bishopric, abbacy, or priory of the king’s *domain* shall be vacant, it shall be in his hand, and he shall receive from it all the revenues and proceeds as of domain.* And when the *time shall come for providing for that church*, our lord the king shall *recommend* the best persons to the church, and the *election* shall be made in the king’s chapel, *with the king’s consent*, and the *advice* of those whom he shall summon for the purpose. And the person elected shall *there* do homage and fealty to our lord the king as to his liege lord, and of his *earthly honours, saving his orders*, before he is consecrated.”

Every word of this article deserves to be studied, because it conveys so expressively at once the audacity of the Crown and the art with which it had to be disguised, in order to avoid *exposing* the utter unwarrantableness of its claims. Mark the phrases employed, for they shew the spirit at work: “The *bishopric* shall be in the king’s hands, and *he* shall receive the proceeds.” The bishopric was now usually understood to mean the *possessions* of the bishopric; for to that alone, it is obvious, allusion is here made, as the temporalities alone had proceeds. “When the time shall come for providing to that church;” *i. e.* in the king’s opinion, who was to be keeper of the temporal possessions so long as the see should be vacant! A pretty guardian! Extremely disinterested! No claim is set up to control the spiritualities, and the Crown cared nothing about them; but the spiritualities were effectually controlled for the sake of the temporalities, and under pretence of the king’s right over the temporalities; for the vacant see was not to be filled up till he pleased! So of the next stage in the proceedings. “The king shall *recommend* the best person” (for his purpose), “and the *election* shall be made” “with the king’s consent.” Here no claim is set up to nomination; but in effect it is to be secured under cover of a compulsory election, or an election with a veto. It is particularly important to observe the equivocal character of the phrase “with his consent.” That may either mean that the king will consent to the appointment of the person elected by the Church, or that the Church shall elect the person to whose appointment the king consents. In the former sense, the elections of bishops had been formerly almost always with the consent of the Crown; in the *latter sense* the Crown now used the expression; *i. e.* converting its consent into a *condition*. And then how insidious the clause at the end: “The person elected shall *there* (and then) do homage to the king for his *earthly honours, saving his orders*, before he is

* *Demesne, i. e.* land originally part of the royal demesnes.

consecrated." Observe with what care all concern with the *spiritual* is *disclaimed*, and yet with what *craft* a control over the spiritual is *secured*. "*There*"—*i. e.* immediately after—contemporaneous with the election; as if to mark the more expressively that it was an essential *part* of the election. "*Before he is consecrated;*" *i. e.* implying that the Church should not consecrate or elect a prelate until he had done homage to the earthly sovereign. And suppose the sovereign, by some chance failing to receive a subservient election, should refuse to receive the "homage;" why, then, according to this article, the consecration must be indefinitely postponed. Thus cunningly did the Crown continue to secure a *veto* on the election to the episcopate, under cover of the most implicit respect for its integrity! And these articles were assented and sworn to by every prelate; even St. Thomas himself being deceived by their craft, and he alone having the honesty and courage to retract his assent, and to disclaim and disavow them.

"No archbishop or bishop shall leave the kingdom without the king's license; and he shall, if he please, take security from them that they will do no harm to the king or kingdom."

The hypocrisy of this article is odious. "Do no harm to the king or kingdom;" *i. e.* what the king *chose to consider harm*, as, for instance, an excommunication for arbitrary and unchristian conduct: for if the "harm" were temporal, or against the law of the land, the prelate would incur the guilt of treason and rebellion, and no new "article" would be wanted to empower the king to seize all his possessions. The real object of the article was to *prevent prelates appealing to Rome* (which the Crown durst hardly yet attempt to prohibit openly); and the key to it is in another article, where the intention of the king comes out pretty plainly:

"Appeals, if they arise, must be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, and from the bishop to the archbishop; and *if the archbishop shall fail in administering justice*" (in the king's opinion), "the parties shall come before our lord the king, that by his precept the controversy may be terminated in the archbishop's court, that so it may *not proceed further*" (*i. e.* to Rome) "without the consent of our lord the king."

Our lord the king was very likely indeed to give his "consent" to an appeal being "carried further," against his own "precept." The hypocrisy of these articles is so odious that it alone might suffice to shew the iniquity and audacity of the claims they set up. Here, four centuries before the Reformation, agreed to by the entire hierarchy (except the primate), is the substance of the infamous act of Henry VIII. for "preventing appeals to Rome." Roger de Wendover says:

"This recognition or inquisition concerning bad customs, liberties, and dignities, detestable to almighty God, was sworn to by the archbishop, bishops, abbots, and clergy. In consequence, *the lay power was exerted without opposition over all ecclesiastical causes*, whether of things or of persons, to the contempt of the ecclesiastical privileges."

And quite as much in contempt of the law of the land; for, as was seen in our first article on the subject, the *Mirror of Justice*—that great record of the law as it existed at and after the Conquest—contains no mention of any of these things; but, on the contrary, *does* declare that the "*Church has*" cognisance of all causes ecclesiastical. The cause, however, is stated by the historian:

"For the *bishops were silent*, or at least rather *muttered* their disapprobation than *openly resisted*. Archbishop Thomas, therefore, reflecting on his rashness in having conceded these impious laws, suspended himself from the service of the altar, and sent to the court of Rome for absolution."

Such was the real character of the contest between the sovereign and the Saint: the question was, whether the Church should be enslaved to the Crown; or, as Eadmer states it, whether the spiritual should be subjected to the temporal. The Archbishop—oppressed and persecuted by legal proceedings, which even Hume, with all his infidel hatred of the Church, avows to have been groundless—departed to Rome. Let it be carefully noted now that neither before nor after the Archbishop's departure did the king attempt any legal proceedings against him for any denial of the claims of the Crown, or any resistance of the constitutions of Clarendon, or any defiance of the king's control over the Church, or any appeal to Rome. What can more clearly shew that the Crown had not the least legal ground for its claims, and was acting in violation of the law of the land as well as of the law of the Church? Every thing that the king could *trump up* against the Saint was charged against him in courts of law; and they only amounted to claims, frivolous and false, about mere matters of money and of account. The course taken by the king was one not vindictive of the law, but of arbitrary and infamous vengeance.

"The king wrote to the sheriff of Kent: I command you if any one, either clerk or laic, shall appeal to Rome, to have him arrested and put in irons until my pleasure be known; also that you seize into your hands all the possessions of the Archbishop of Canterbury's clerks; and *arrest the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, nephews and nieces, of all the clerks who are with the Archbishop* . . . The king also

commanded the Church of Canterbury and all the goods of the Archbishop and his clerks to be confiscated, and banished all his kindred (*an act unheard of in former history*), without regard to condition, age, or sex; and he forbade any one to *pray* for the Archbishop."

Were any thing wanting to evince that the spirit of the king, in his contest with the Saint, was from hell, these last words were amply enough. It is not necessary, however, now to trace further the blessed Saint's course to martyrdom: all we have wanted to shew concerning it is, that he was sustained by the law of the land, and that the Crown had been *encroaching* on the Church, and was so *bent* upon enslaving her, that by the sacrifice of martyrdom alone could she be saved. This is made yet clearer, if possible, by the Archbishop's letter to the Archbishop of York:

"Whereas the king of England wished his son to be crowned; and it appears that the king has caused the crown to be placed on his son's head by your hands, and that the *oath prescribed for the maintenance of the Church's liberties was not only not taken, but not even demanded by you; but that, on the contrary, the unjust customs of the kingdom, by which the Church's dignity is in danger of being shipwrecked, were ratified by oath* We are grieved *at the weakness* which you and your brother bishops have displayed, retreating ingloriously like rams not having horns, neglecting to take the shield of faith, and stand up for the Lord's house on the day of battle."

If the new constitutions or the "customs" they set up were not contrary to the "oath prescribed" (in the coronation service) "for the maintenance of the Church's liberties," how came it that this oath was "not only not taken, but *not demanded*" by the Archbishop of York on the part of the Church? The only reason can be, that he had sworn to the "constitutions" and the "customs;" and they were contrary to the usual oath to maintain the Church's liberties. It seems scarcely necessary therefore to state that the king, as soon as the "constitutions" had been agreed to by the hierarchy, felt it necessary to have them confirmed by the Holy See, to which he sent them for that purpose,—a course utterly contradictory to the articles themselves; for if the king could prohibit appeals to the Pope, he was superior to the Pope; and why ask his "confirmation?" and if these were the ancient laws and customs of the realm, why submit them to a foreign prince or prelate? As little necessary is it to state that, after the Saint's martyrdom, the king solemnly disclaimed and renounced the assumptions of these audacious articles. We read, however, that

“The suffragan bishops of the province of Canterbury, with the seniors of the monastery, *elected* Richard, prior of Dover, to the archbishopric; and immediately the bishop elect swore fealty to the king, ‘*saving his orders*,’ and no mention was made of observing the ‘customs of the kingdom.’”*

Afterwards we read (A.D. 1174):

“The Archbishop of Canterbury returned from Rome, bringing back with him the pall and the primacy of England. Arriving at London, he convoked the principal clergy belonging to the vacant churches which had *lately elected* fresh *prelates*, and *confirmed* and consecrated the *bishops elect* of Winchester, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester.”

Is it possible not to perceive that, *per legem ecclesiæ*, and not less so *per legem Angliæ*, the archiepiscopal confirmation of the election of a bishop was as essential as the papal confirmation of the election of a primate; and that the influence or power acquired by the Crown over these appointments was an encroachment equally on the law of the land and of the Church? And it is with this clearly in our minds, that we should read the previous passage respecting the elections to those sees:

“About this time the king conceded that the *elections to vacant churches should be freely made*, and the following appointments took place with the consent of the Crown. Richard to the see of Winchester, Geoffrey to that of Ely, &c.”

Two things are here observable; first, that though it is said the “king *conceded*” the “free election,” it has been shewn, from the history and laws of the Anglo-Saxon age, that the Church always *had* the right, and that the king only “conceded,” that he could not interfere with it, by stretching into a claim of right whatever the Church had “conceded” as courtesy. And next it is to be remarked, how the phrase already alluded to as equivocal, “with the king’s consent,” is here clearly used in what we contend is its primitive and proper import: that of the king’s consent to the appointment of every person who should be elected freely by the Church; *not* that contrary sense in which the Crown constantly sought to apply the phrase, that of the Church electing a person to whom the king consented; in which sense the usage, the history, and the law would be equally self-contradictory and absurd.

The Church had usually made her elections *with* the consent of the king; the Crown now had sought to contend that it was by *reason* of the consent of the king. But this we repeat is plainly opposed to the history, the usage, and the law;

* Roger de Wendover, A.D. 1173.

and was clearly an *encroachment*. How the Crown *did* encroach, is sufficiently shewn by a single passage in the history of the next reign :

“The king, by the advice of the Archbishops and Bishops, *gave* to his brother the archbishopric of York, and *appointed* Godfrey to the bishopric of Winchester,” &c.*

How entirely the position of things had been by this time reversed from what it was in the primitive age of the English Church ! *Then* the Church ‘*gave*’ bishoprics with the advice (perhaps) of the king : an advice asked of her faithful sons out of courtesy. *Now* we find the “*king gave* bishoprics” “with the advice” of the Church. The cause of this change is disclosed in the very next sentence :

“Hugh Bishop of Durham bought for himself and his see the *earldom of Northumberland* ; and when the king girded on him the sword, he said to his attendants with a laugh, ‘I have made a young earl out of an old bishop.’”

Yes ; one can conceive the laugh that went round the circle of courtiers at the spectacle of the “old bishop” (how unlike St. Alphonsus or St. Charles Borromeo !) buckling on the armour of an earl. And one can conceive the sort of courtly stuff of which such bishops were made, and the kind of “advice” they would give the king with respect to appointments to the episcopate. It is of the same man we read soon after :

“By bribes he usurped to himself the empty titles of earl and justiciary, *mixed himself up with secular affairs, and paid little regard to the duties of a pastor.*”

Can the reader fail to compare this character of a *courtly* bishop with that of an *uncourtly* one, St. Thomas, who on his election *gave up* all secular employment, and so caused the first ill-feeling on the part of the king ? Which of the two classes of prelates were most faithful to the Church ? Let us look at another specimen of the *courtly* prelates, who were paving the way for the enslaving of the Church. We read that, at the *request of the king*, the Pope had consented that William Bishop of Ely (who of course had stimulated the request) should be chancellor. And a year after we find :

“This chancellor had become very great, and was both king and priest ; and was not content with the episcopal dignity alone, but shewed his vanity and haughtiness by saying at the beginning of his letters, ‘We, William, by the grace of God Bishop of Ely, chancellor of our lord the king, justiciary of all England, and legate of the Apostolic See ;’ and exercised to an immoderate excess the *dignities he had obtained by bribery.*”

* Wendover.

Here is the clue to his corrupt character, *and that of the English Church in his time*; and the result is depicted in the next passage:

“Never was there land for sale which he did not purchase; never was there a church or abbey vacant which he did not dispose of or retain for himself.”

Of course what power he had *gained by money he used for money*. How remarkable is the contrast presented in the following brief narration, A. D. 1194:

“Herbert, surnamed ‘*the Poor*,’ was *canonically elected* to the bishopric of Salisbury, and consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury.”

Is it *an accidental coincidence* that whenever we read of the king’s having concerned himself with or controlled the election of a prelate, there is corruption; but when the election is really ‘*canonical*’ and ‘*free*,’ there is usually a good Bishop? Is it by *chance* that men who love money are found getting bishoprics from the Crown, and men who love honesty receiving them from the Church?

William of Ely was the successor of men like Folliott, and the precursor of men like Beaufort and Wolsey. “Herbert the Poor” was the representative of the Disciples, and Saints like St. Anselm and St. Thomas; and we shall find that when such men ceased to arise in the English Church, she *fell*. There were already far *too few* of such men. We meet continually in this and the following reigns such passages as these:

“The Archbishop (Hubert) appointed as prior a Norman named Jorbert, who, *on account of his skill in secular affairs*, had received the *government of three priories*; and Hubert, *to satisfy the avarice* of the aforesaid Jorbert, *added a fourth priory*. * * * About that time the monks of Canterbury complained to the Pope that the Archbishop, contrary to the dignity of his station, was acting as justiciary of England, and *paid attention to secular affairs more than was proper, neglecting the affairs of the Church*. The Pope commanded the king, immediately on receipt of his letters, under penalty of an interdict, to dismiss the aforesaid Archbishop from the office of justiciary, as it was *especially forbidden Bishops to meddle with secular affairs*.”

There were already more Huberts than Herberts, it is clear: and when we find that it is this Hubert who consents to set the crown on the head of John, we know what value to attach to the oath administered by such a prelate *to such a prince*, that he would love holy Church, and preserve it harmless from evil persons’ attempts; and we are not much surprised to read directly afterwards that

“The Archbishop of York was, by command of the king, deprived of all the emoluments of his archbishopric; for the sheriff of York had presumed to attack with violence his manors, and the property of the clerks and other religious men, and to make a division of their goods; on which the said Archbishop excommunicated the said sheriff; for which the latter had excited the king’s wrath against the prelate.”

Here is the Eynsford case again: and once for all we may as well state that the worldly kings and barons of that age did not at all *like* excommunication. Bad as they were, they did not disguise from themselves that it was a very serious and shocking thing; and hence they were very angry when the sentence was denounced against them or their retainers, and took every means to avert it except the right one,—giving up their plunder and rapine. This, therefore, was a constant subject of contest between the Church and the Crown; until at last, as will be seen in the sequel, the Crown secured just such an indirect kind of control over this terrible spiritual weapon as we have already seen it had begun to acquire indirectly over the episcopate itself. Let it be carefully noted, however, that the Crown, so lately as the beginning of the fourteenth century, did *not claim any right to control* the spiritual power of the Church as exercised in a sentence of excommunication. We read not, here nor elsewhere, that the king dared to dispute the right or the power, but only that he was enraged when it was exerted either against himself or his satellites. Let us now return to the all-important question of the episcopate, and read a passage touching a *saint’s* way of dealing with it, as contrasted with the *sovereign’s*.

“The king had held in his own hand the church of Lincoln, *which had been for some years deprived of the care of a bishop*; to atone for which offence as well as he could, he *procured the appointment by election* of the blessed Hugh, of reverend memory, to the government of that church. When his election was announced to the man of God, he would *not accept it until it was first made clear to him that he did so by the common consent of the church of Lincoln*. After he had been perfectly satisfied on these points, and the dean and elders (chapter) of the Church had (again) elected him, he was consecrated.”

Two things are here to be noted. First, the significant indication of the insidious way in which the Crown had encroached on the Church in respect to the episcopate (by converting its custom of recommendation into a claim of right), and *concealed* its encroachment under such a careful kind of phraseology as that here adopted (very expressively) by the

historian : "the king *procured his appointment by election ;*" as if the 'election' were only the *mode* or *mask* of an 'appointment.' Next, it is to be observed how careful a *saint* was not to sanction such an encroachment, and the corruption which had led to it; since he would *not accept* of the episcopate, until *satisfied* by a *second* election that it really *was* an election, and *not* a mere royal appointment. If we mistake not, this short narrative of the blessed Hugh is pregnant with much important meaning as regards the position which even an *endowed* Church should assume towards the Crown.

We now beg our readers' special attention to the history of the great quarrel respecting the see of Canterbury, which led to a rupture between the king and the Pope as decisive and disastrous as that which had occurred in the reign of John's father. The whole transaction is most important, as illustrating the relations of the Church and the Crown in respect to the episcopate. We read in Wendover :

"The juniors of the conventual church at Canterbury, *without asking the king's consent*, elected Reginald, sub-prior, as their archbishop; and he took some monks of the convent and went to Rome, taking an oath not to shew the letters he held, that his election might be concealed from the king, until they found out whether they could at the court of Rome carry the election."

Clearly the convent considered the supreme power over the episcopate was not in the king but in the Pope, but apprehended an interference on the part of the king, which it equally clear was quite usual; and the sequel shews it sufficiently :

"Arrived at Rome, he made known his election to our lord the Pope and his cardinals, and openly shewing his letters to all, boldly required the Pope to confirm his election by the apostolic benediction; but the Pope answered that he would take time to consider of it, in order that he might be more assured of the truth of the before-named circumstances. The monks of Canterbury, in the mean time, as soon as they had heard that their sub-prior had violated his oath, and declared every where he was elected, were enraged against him, and *sent to the king to ask his 'permission' to choose a pastor suited to them.*"

Here, let it be observed, the monks were clearly seeking to evade the authority of the Pope, who was, as they themselves shewed they were quite conscious, the proper judge of the validity of the post-election, or of its avoidance by any offence of the Archbishop elect. By what coincidence does it happen that any thing oblique or corrupt in the Church is

certain to be seen connected with or appealing to the Crown? The sequel is significant:

"The king *immediately and without any hesitation* granted their request, *and, speaking confidentially, hinted that the Bishop of Norwich was a great friend of his*; on which account, he asserted that it would be *to the advantage of himself and the kingdom* if they could transfer the said prelate to the archbishopric; and he promised to confer many honours on the convent if they listened to him. The monks assembled thereupon, and, *in order to conciliate the king*, elected the Bishop, who was at York, *managing the king's business*."

What did he in the *north*, when he should serve his Church in the *east*? John Bishop of Norwich was more like Hubert than Herbert or Hugh; he was a man after the king's own heart. However, the matter did not go smoothly; the monks made a pretty mess of it. The reader must remark that they had not told the king of their former election; but "murder will out."

"The king sent some of the monks to Rome to obtain from our lord the Pope the confirmation of the election of John Bishop of Norwich: at the same time, the suffragan Bishops of Canterbury sent agents to Rome to lay a complaint before the Pope that the monks had presumed to elect an Archbishop without them, although they ought, by common right and ancient custom, to have been present at the election as well as the monks."

The Pope gave it in favour of the monks; but then came on their own "disgraceful dispute," as Wendover calls it.

"A certain part of them presented Reginald the sub-prior, and the other portion of them presented John the Bishop. At length the Pope, seeing that *both* elections had been made irregularly, *annulled both*."

Matthew Paris states:

"The king had given his word to the monks to accept whomsoever they should elect; but it had been agreed between the king and them that they should elect John Bishop of Norwich. The monks, however, when they knew that the election of John was displeasing to the Pope, were induced by the Pope to say they could elect whom they pleased; and chose, with the pope's advice, Stephen Langton, cardinal, and equal, if not superior, to any in the kingdom for probity and learning."

It is worth while to pause to remark, that papal appointments or free elections are usually *good* ones; while kingly appointments (unless the king happens to have been a saint) are almost always bad.

Wendover states it thus :

“Our lord the Pope persuaded the monks of Canterbury to elect Stephen Langton, cardinal priest, a man skilled and discreet. The monks declared that they were not allowed, except by the king’s consent and the choice of the canons, to make any election.”

Cunning as they were, the poor monks were caught in their own trap. The holy Pontiff probably suspected the truth : observe how broadly he asserts the Church’s independence :

“The Pope said, *‘It is not the custom that the consent of princes should be waited for concerning elections made at the Apostolic See. Therefore, by virtue of your obedience, we command you, who are so many that you fully suffice to make the election, to elect as Archbishop the man whom we gave you as a father and as pastor of your souls.’* The monks, dreading the sentence of excommunication, reluctantly consented, and the Pope consecrated Langton.”

And now all came out :

“The king was exceedingly enraged, and accused the monks of treachery. After having banished them, he sent letters to the Pope, accusing him of having, in prejudice of the rights of the Crown, consecrated a prelate *‘elected without the king’s consent.’*”

The Pope broadly and decisively reiterated his assertion of the independence of the Church and the supremacy of the Holy See ; and in doing so distinctly indicates, what we have already intimated, that concessions were often made by the Church to the Crown in *courtesy*, which, after becoming customs, were claimed as *rights*.

“We wrote to you with all deference, and *deferred to you more than we ought. Although it is not the custom, when elections are made at the Apostolic See, to wait for the consent of any prince*, we sent two monks to you for the special purpose of asking your consent ; but they were detained at Dover, so that they were not able to fulfil their instructions. We, who *hold full authority over this Church of Canterbury, condescended to ask a favour of a king* ; and our courier also delivered the letters of the prior and monks who had made the election, which were written to ask your consent ; and after all this we *did not deem it our business again to ask your consent*, but endeavoured, without inclining to the right or left, to do that which the canonical ordinances of the holy fathers order to be done, so that there may be no delay in making arrangements, that the Lord’s flock might not be left longer without a pastor.”

The Pontiff coolly tells the king in clear terms that the

asking the royal consent was a *mere form and courtesy*, and that it mattered not at all whether the consent were given or not. Mark with what dignity the holy Father asserts the awful claims of the See of St. Peter, and in *what prophetic language* he denounces divine vengeance against the king if he continued contumacious:

“Therefore, beloved son, to whose dignity we have yielded deference more than we ought, endeavour to pay proper deference to our dignity, that you may be rewarded more abundantly with the grace of God and our favour. But, perhaps, should you act differently, *you may bring yourself into difficulties from which you will not easily be extricated*; for it must be that He is supreme to whom every knee is bent of those in heaven, or earth, or under the earth, and whose functions on earth we, although undeserving, are appointed to perform. It would not be *safe* for you to shew resistance in this matter to God and the Church, for which the blessed martyr and glorious high-priest Thomas recently shed his blood, especially too since your father and mother abjured this wicked custom before the legates of the Apostolic See.”

The king proved rebellious; the Pope proved a prophet. The historian says the monarch was “mad with rage;” commenced a dreadful persecution against the clergy, soon became hateful to his subjects, and had his nobles in rebellion against him. These barons, the promoters of the Great Charter, are always regarded as the guardians and champions of the laws and liberties of England. Let us look, then, to the Charter, and take their verdict on the question at issue between the Pope and the king, so far as it respected the laws and liberties of the realm. The very recitals of the Charter suffice. That very Stephen Langton, whose nomination by the Holy See had caused the rupture with, and the resistance of, the king, is on the part of the English Church, along with the barons on the part of the English realm, one of the chief parties to the charter:

“John, &c. by the advice of our Venerable Father Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church.”

And we read that the Cardinal Archbishop had been one of the prime movers with the barons of the demand for the Charter, which was an echo of that of Henry I. and of the laws of the Confessor, and which contained this clause:

“We confirm that the English Church be a free church, and keep its laws entire and liberties unfringed, and *that freedom of election* be observed.”

This “freedom of election,” it is obvious from the preced-

ing history, means freedom from the interference of the sovereign, not of the Holy See, by whose authority alone the very Archbishop who procured this charter (copying it in substance from that of Henry) had been nominated. Thus, then, it is clear that in the reign of John it was as much recognised by the barons of England as part of the law of England as it was asserted by the Pope as part of the law of the Church, that the Holy See, and not the sovereign, had supreme paramount power of nomination to the archiepiscopal and all other sees of the country. It is important to observe this before considering the circumstances of the next reign, which we shall find are preludes to a new and very different idea of the law of the land, enunciated by the courts of law in the reign of the first two Edwards, and (very unnecessarily, if it *were* the law,) enacted by parliament in the reign of the third, in those acts of *præmunire* and *provisors* of which so much has been of late *said*, and of which so little is known, but which proved, although not so intended, in the history of our ecclesiastical legislation, precursors of the fatal and schismatic statutes of Henry VIII.

It is interesting and not unimportant to mention an incident at the outset of the reign of Henry III. strongly confirmatory of what we have contended for, that the course taken by such prelates as St. Thomas and St. Anselm, and so recently pursued by their successor Langton, was quite as much in conformity with the law of the land as with the law of the Church. Wendover tells us of the translation of the relics of St. Thomas thus:

“The body of St. Thomas, the archbishop and martyr, was taken out of its marble tomb by Stephen Archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of the king and almost all the bishops *and earls and barons* of the kingdom, and was placed in a shrine elaborately worked with gold and jewels. At this translation were also present archbishops and bishops of various other countries, who eagerly assembled to be present at this great solemnity; for they considered it a most proper duty to honour and worship this holy martyr in Christ’s cause, *who shed his blood for the Catholic Church, and had unflinchingly fought for it to the last.*”

When, some centuries after, this shrine was desecrated and despoiled by the new “head of the English Church,” it was discovered that St. Thomas had been a traitor and a rebel to God and to his sovereign. The “bishops of other countries,” present at the translation of the Saint’s relics, were witnesses that his conduct had been justified *per legem ecclesiæ*; while the barons were good judges as to its having been justified *per legem Angliæ*. Nor let it be said that the Great

Charter was wrung from John by force; for it was a copy of that conceded by the first Henry, and was deliberately (some years after acquiring firm possession of the Crown) confirmed by the *third*.

These charters confirmed to the Church the right of *free election* to the episcopate. What this meant is shewn by a single passage from Matthew of Paris (A.D. 1229), quite confirming all that has been contended for:

"The Bishop of Ely died, and the monks, by common consent, elected Hugh abbot of St. Edmund's, who, when presented to the king, was willingly accepted of by him, and was *invested with all the property of the bishopric*."*

Here the language used and the course pursued equally indicate how well it was understood that the province of the Crown is restricted to an investiture of the *temporalities*. And so afterwards we read, in the same historian, that the monks of Canterbury had elected the Bishop of Chichester as Archbishop:

"And *after making the election*, they presented him to the king, who willingly accepted him *so far as he was concerned*, and immediately *invested him with the manors and other possessions pertaining to the archbishopric*."

Nothing could more clearly convey that the Crown was well aware that it was only "concerned" with the *possessions pertaining to the archbishopric*, and had no concern with the *archbishopric*.

So much for the king's concern with the episcopate. The history of the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury for a few years will as clearly illustrate the universal understanding as to the supreme and absolute power of the Pope:

"The monks went to Rome, and demanded a *confirmation* by the apostolic authority of the election they had made. The Pope caused an inquisition to be made, and then replied, that the Archbishop elect was a *courtier* and illiterate; for which reason he *annulled the election*."

Thus then, while, on the one hand, the king had rightly no concern with the election, the Pope's *confirmation* was necessary to give it validity, and he had absolute power to *annul* it altogether. Of course this is not stated by way of information for Catholics on the rights of the Holy See, but as a necessary introduction to the history of that fatal era in the history of the English Church which commences in this very reign. Let us proceed, however, with the narrative of the see of Canterbury:

"Afterwards Master John was elected to the archbishopric.

* Roger de Wendover.

But it was divulged at Rome that, after his election, he had received a thousand marks of silver as a present from Peter Bishop of Winchester, besides another thousand marks which that bishop had lent him to help him in obtaining his promotion; besides this, it was reported that the said John had confessed at Rome that he held two benefices to which the cure of souls was entrusted, in opposition to the decrees of the General Council. But inasmuch as the *election of three of the Archbishops of Canterbury had been annulled lately*, and the church had been long without a pastor, the Pope gave permission to the monks to elect Master Edmund, canon of Salisbury."

And we afterwards read that "Master Edmund" was duly consecrated. It is not necessary to comment on the disgraceful disclosures here made as to the corrupt condition of the English Church, of which we will give another illustration. We read that

"Richard Archbishop of Canterbury (predecessor of Edmund) went to Rome (A.D. 1230), and made complaints to the Pope that some of his suffragan Bishops, neglecting their pastoral duties, sat in the king's exchequer court, examining into the causes of the laity; and that beneficed clergy held several churches to which the cure of souls belonged, and that, like the bishops, they intermeddled with secular business. His Holiness, seeing that his complaints were supported by justice, gave orders that they should be attended to; and the king's clerks made excuses without effect. The Archbishop, having completed his business to his satisfaction, set out on his return, but died on the journey; and *with him died also all the advantages which he had gained in the business.*"*

And in the same reign we find Pope Gregory writing thus:

"It has frequently come under our notice that the churches of the Canterbury district have dreadfully fallen off in spiritual and temporal matters, owing to the evil-mindedness of those employed in them."

It must be apparent that by this time the English Church had become exceedingly worldly, and that her clergy too often thought more of the *temporalities* than the *spiritualities* of the priesthood or the episcopate. And what is most important to observe is, that, in proportion as this spirit prevailed, the Church receded from the Holy See, and was attracted towards the Crown.

Hitherto we have seen that the nation and the Church perfectly recognised the absolute supremacy of the Holy See over her episcopate, and repeatedly resorted to it for protec-

* Wendover.

tion against the Crown. This, we repeat, is the great thing to be regarded in the history of the English Church from the Conquest to the reign of Henry III.; whereas the great thing to be regarded in its history from the reign of the third Henry to the reign of the eighth is, that we find the Crown and the Church and the nation making (more or less) *common cause against the Holy See*; and that there is first national feeling against the Holy See, then the law is altered in accordance with this feeling, and acts of parliament are enacted expressly against what people affected to consider "papal encroachments." What these so-called encroachments were, and whether they were to any extent (of course apart from particular and individual instances) different from the system of the Anglo-Saxon Church, we shall have to consider; as also whether the laws directed against the Holy See upon these subjects differed at all in principle, however they might in detail or degree, from the legislation of the reign of Henry VIII. It is, in fact, to the history of the era of the Reformation that we propose now to direct attention; the commencement of that era dating, in our opinion, from the reign of Henry III., at the close of which we first find the nation and the Crown united against the Holy See under the pretence of *temporal* encroachment, as unfounded as the pretence *finally* set up of *spiritual* encroachment.

It seemed as though, by the infallible instinct of secret sympathy, worldliness in the Church was drawn towards the State as its source and centre, and drawn away from that holy obedience which is the soul of spirituality. So it is, however—a clear, plain matter of history—that as the English Church became worldly, she became subservient to the Crown, and less obedient and devoted to the Holy See. At first it was only with regard to *temporalities* that the tendency to rebellion displayed itself. But it is to be carefully remarked, as the great lesson to be learned from the history of the English Church in this regard, that resistance, commencing with things temporal, found its inevitable termination in schism as to things *spiritual*. The *principle* of rebellion being admitted, the logic of human nature carried it to its consummation. We have now to see how an age of corruption gave rise to an era of rebellion, ending in the schism and separation, but commencing only with the pretence of temporal encroachment. We must premise that, from the first establishment of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom under a unity of temporal sovereignty, or rather from the first establishment of that Catholic faith which linked together the separate Anglo-Saxon states under the same spiritual sovereignty, that headship was acknowledged, and the

obligation upon all Christian nations to support it, in ours recognised by the payment of Peter's pence to the see of Rome,—a payment sanctioned and enjoined by the laws of every Anglo-Saxon king from Offa to Edward, and not less by the Norman sovereigns from the reign of the first William to that of the third Henry, or (we may at once say) to that of the *eighth*.

This being borne in mind, and further, that our Anglo-Saxon ancestors conceived, in their simplicity, that the different Christian nations who are comprised within the pale of the Catholic Church, under the headship of the see of Peter, were as much bound to look to the support of that see as the Christian people of a diocese were to look to the support of its Bishop,—let us glance at the position of the papacy towards the middle of the reign of Henry III., which will explain what afterwards occurred. In plain English, the Holy See was in distress, and was very much in want of money in order to defend its possessions, the patrimony of St. Peter, and the integrity of the See itself, from the unscrupulous aggressions of the emperor. The Pope had therefore claimed from the English Church its special contributions in the form of a tithe of all incomes, clerical and lay. The king himself was convinced of the reasonableness of the demand, and agreed to it. The English hierarchy, therefore, could hardly refuse, but murmured secretly, and the laity openly. That the priests and prelates of England should be reluctant to pay money even for the defence of their spiritual head, will not seem surprising after reading so many specimens of their eagerness to get money, and the worldliness which made so many of them deem the Church a mere *means* of getting money. Avarice and covetousness naturally accompany each other; and hence the English clergy as well as the laity murmured at contributions which their Anglo-Saxon ancestors would have rejoiced in. About the same time, also, we discover the same spirit displayed in a dispute, the exact origin of which is obscure, but of which we can collect this much distinctly, that the English clergy were jealous of foreign priests who were presented by the Pope to benefices in England. It is all important to observe, at the outset of this long rankling dispute, that no complaints are made that these foreign priests are less learned, deserving, or devout than the English; it was put by the opponents of the Holy See in this matter simply on the score of *money*. Thus they complain “that the Roman pontiffs and the legates have conferred the benefices of the kingdom on their followers at their pleasure, to the great prejudice of *others of the kingdom*, and of the bishops,

to whom the collation of benefices properly belongs. Besides the other *burdens* which they have imposed on the laity, and as well as on clerks *concerning their property and benefices*, they wish to take from the clergy of this kingdom the *benefices they hold*, to confer them on their *Roman* followers.* And the next thing we desire to be observed is, that there is not the slightest symptom of all this being deemed at all otherwise than *legal*; for no appeal is made to the law against these papal presentments; and, on the contrary, it is the very complaint made, that the Pope "*conferred*" these benefices, *i. e.* legally, because otherwise his acts would be void and of no effect, and therefore no injury at all to any one, and the presentments of the local patrons could be enforced by the courts of law. Two things, then, are clear as regards the close of the reign of Henry III.: that the Pope was considered to have power, *per legem ecclesiæ et per legem Angliæ*, to present any priest to any benefice or bishopric in England; and that the exercise of this power had excited jealousy and envy among the English clergy. A third thing unhappily is clear, that the latter were very worldly and corrupt. And there is a fourth fact to be borne in mind, that there is no evidence of the priests presented to benefices by the Pope being inferior to the others; while there is evidence, of which we have adduced a good deal, that papal appointments to the *prelacy* were as usually *good* as those made at home were usually *bad*.

Such, then, was the state of things in the reign of the third Henry. In our next we shall see what happened from that time until the reign of the eighth.

THOUGHTS ON THE FESTIVAL OF THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

To sympathise with the subject of the great festival on which the Church celebrates the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven, but two things are required. One is, the belief that Mary is the Mother of God; and the other is, a belief in the resurrection of the body. All we ask is, that they who believe in the doctrine of the Incarnation,—that is, who believe that Jesus is very God and very Man; God of the substance of his Father, begotten from all eternity; and Man of the substance of his Mother, born eighteen hundred and fifty-one

* Roger de Wendover, vol. ii. A.D. 1231.

years ago in the stable of Bethlehem,—and who cannot therefore deny to Mary the dignity of Mother of God; and who also believe that article of the Creed which they often repeat, “the resurrection of the body;” all we ask, or indeed expect, is, that they should concede at least this much, that the belief of Catholics, that Mary’s resurrection has forestalled the great day, is a most reasonable belief. God is omnipotent; therefore He had assuredly the power to raise the body of his Mother. Mary is his Mother. Can we doubt, then, that He had the will?

But we think we hear some Protestant asking, why we insinuate that he possibly may not believe in the resurrection of the body? Does not every professed Christian do so? In words, doubtless; but we are quite sure not in reality. If Protestants believe it in a sense, the generality do not think or care much about it. This may appear, at first sight, somewhat strange. First of all, because so much is said in the New Testament of the resurrection of the body; so much stress is laid upon it; it is so often referred to, and held out as a special subject of rejoicing and object of hope; and as Protestants affect to derive all their religion from the Bible, the prominence given to the promise of the resurrection of the flesh ought naturally to entitle it to a prominence in their thoughts. Secondly, it is strange, because Protestants do not appear to us to care less than Catholics about their bodies, but rather considerably more. How, then, is it that they are so indifferent to the promise of the resurrection of those bodies? Perhaps this is the very reason; they care so much, or rather in so wrong a way, about their bodies. They care for them in an animal sort of way; and feeling, as they must, that heaven will not be a place for animal gratification, they do not exactly see what will be the use of a body there, or the pleasure of possessing one. When they hear of a glorified body, it just to them means nothing at all. They have no sympathy with what its enjoyments may be; they do not realise that it can have any, or add any thing to the happiness of a state which at best can hardly be said to be the object of their aspirations or desires, but to the prospect of which we may rather say they become *resigned*, especially as life advances, and its troubles and sufferings reconcile them to any change which promises them freedom from these afflictions. Thus men speak of death as a happy release in such cases; but their notions seldom soar much higher. Of course there are exceptions, many we would hope; as we hope also that many implicit members of the true Church may be found among them. Still, generally speaking, even where the thought of the resurrection is

dwelt upon piously by good Protestants, it appears to us that, while comforting themselves with the prospect of a future state of happiness for their souls, they have very indefinite views as to the share which their bodies are to have in the heavenly reward.

And so the resurrection of the body of Jesus himself is regarded rather under the aspect of a proof vouchsafed to shew that it was verily He who appeared again after his death and burial, than as a glorious fact, and a pledge of the resurrection of these very bodies of ours. This seems to come from a low view of our bodies altogether, as if they were a mere temporary and animal economy to supply the needs of our present state. Men forget that a body is an integral part of man in his perfect state. God created him with both a body and soul; which body and soul, but for sin, would never have been separated, but together would have been glorified after the period of probation had passed. God, we must remember, made the material world as well as the spiritual; and he made it, like all his works, to shew forth his glory, and to speak of Him. There is a oneness in all his works; it could not be otherwise; and his own nature and attributes are stamped upon all. The spiritual world is made to his image; the material is as a glass reflecting the eternal truths that are in Him, and shadowing forth divine mysteries. Now man by his body is connected with this material world, and it is sin only which has made that connexion a source of sensuality. It was not so in the beginning; it is not *necessarily* so even now. It is our impure and earthly natures which make it so. We have only to remember the, we may say, almost purifying and sanctifying effect which is produced by the sight of some lovely natural prospect, when sea and sky and air seem bathed as it were in divinity, and this upon some heart shut at other times to all spiritual affections; or the effect of music in raising holy thoughts in the mind, and bringing heavenly visions before the imagination,—to be convinced that material nature, being symbolical of the Eternal Godhead, the chain which connects us with it, cannot be what men, alas, too commonly make it, a mere channel of animal gratification. Of course Catholics will feel much more strongly what we are about to say than Protestants; but even the sense of smell, which would seem to be much more sensual in its character than that of sight or hearing, can speak most potently of divine things. God is fragrance as well as music. “Thy name is as oil poured out” (Cant. i. 2). “Myrrh and stacte and cassia perfume thy garments” (Ps. xliv. 8). Now, not the colour and the form alone, but the scent of each flower

seems to have a divine signification in it. Not only does the whiteness of the lily recall to us the beauty of purity and virginity, and remind us of his love for them who is described as "feeding among the lilies" (Cant ii. 16). Not only does the deep red of the rose remind us of that charity which has its source in the precious blood of the Redeemer, and of her especially whom we salute as the "mystical rose," but every smell seems to convey to our hearts, through our senses, the odour of some peculiar virtue. And, again, the different character in the smell of spring, summer, and autumn flowers—what are these but symbolical of the special graces of different ages? The pure and downy freshness of the odour of spring flowers, how does it tell of the early graces of innocence and holy childhood! the deeper and more intense, and, so to say, impassioned fragrance of the summer flower, of the richer and more powerful graces which the Sun of Justice calls forth in the man's heart! while the almost pungent odour of some, and the languid sweetness of others among the autumn flowers, seem to speak of the deep-rooted holiness of the perfect Christian, as his race is nearly run, and of the languishing of his heart after his eternal home, and the bosom of God, his sovereign good and everlasting reward. And, again, the smell of incense—what Catholic but will bear witness to its direct, as it were, spiritual effect upon the mind? And if all this be the case here below, where our tendency to sensuality is so great that such as aim at perfection will often deny themselves every innocent pleasure of which the senses are the channel, lest aught too earthly might mingle with it, what will it be hereafter, when no such danger will exist, when every spiritualised and glorified sense shall be full of God, even as the intellectual soul shall be replenished and satiated with Him?

The body, then, is intended to have its share in our future reward. But what need to prove this, since, when God willed to unite Himself to our nature, He took a human body as well as a soul; and that not only that He might suffer in it, but also reign in it, raising it gloriously from the tomb, and carrying it up to heaven, to sit with it upon the throne of the Triune God? To Him be glory and dominion through everlasting ages.

We read in the Psalms that God would not suffer his "Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. xv. 10). This prophecy was fulfilled when, on the third day, the glorious soul of our Lord Jesus Christ returned to resume his sacred body, and rise all resplendent with it from the tomb on Easter morning. Now it was the flesh of Mary of which that sacred body was formed; and was it not reasonable to expect that neither

would He suffer the pure and holy body of his Mother to moulder in the grave, especially when we remember that He had already, as a special grace, raised the bodies of many of the ancient Saints, and reunited them to their souls, to accompany his triumphal ascension into heaven? If so gracious to his servants, should we not expect that he would be far more munificent to his immaculate Mother; she who was not only free from every spot of sin, but had been preserved stainless in her conception even from original sin, and from the common debt of contracting it? However, we are not left to reasonable conjecture on the subject, as the universal tradition of the Church has preserved the memory of this great event. We will give a brief account of what tradition has handed down.

Our Lord, as we learn from Scripture, committed his Virgin Mother to the care of his virgin disciple, the beloved St. John, at the foot of the cross. From that hour he took her to his own home (John xix. 27). With what love and reverence did he guard and serve the tabernacle of God incarnate! It seemed as if he who had reclined on the sacred bosom of Jesus was alone worthy to receive the charge of her in whose pure womb He had lain. And how did Mary, the humblest as she was the most exalted of creatures, behave towards the beloved disciple? She, so infinitely the superior even of that holy Apostle, as she is of the highest seraph who stands before the throne of God, saw in him her Son Jesus, whom he represented, and who had committed him to her on the hill of Calvary. But how can we sufficiently appreciate the sacrifice which Mary made in thus remaining to console and succour the suffering Church on earth, when her reward was due to her in heaven, and her throne of glory awaited her at the right hand of her Son? She, by her compassion, had shared his passion with Him. The flood of her sorrows had exceeded, as the ocean exceeds a tiny lake, all the griefs and pains which the whole army of martyrs have borne, or shall bear, till their number is completed; and the sum of her merits surpassed those of all the angels and saints united. High as the dignity of Mother of God soars above all dignities, and deep as is the unfathomable mystery of the divine maternity, even thus in proportion high was her transcendent sanctity, and deep and untold the bitter anguish of the chalice of which she had drunk with Jesus. Her reward was due to her; and who can doubt that the love of her Son was ready to confer it upon her? and who can doubt that she was permitted, by her own free choice, thus to add to her already priceless accumulation of merits? Mary's consent was asked when she became the

Mother of God. We remember her answer: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word" (Luke i. 38). Mary had no other will than God's will; therefore she willed fervently, intensely, whatever He willed. She willed the salvation of men; and as the Eternal Father gave his Son to die for our redemption, so she united her own will to his, and freely offered Him to accomplish this work, yea, though she knew the sword was to pierce her own soul. It was thus that she brought Him to present Him to his heavenly Father in the Temple, knowing that He was the true Lamb of God who was to be slain to take away the sin of the world, and, as such, making an oblation of Him. Again, do we remember how Mary "*stood* by the cross of Jesus?" (John xix. 25.) Not a word in Scripture but has its meaning. Why is it said that she "*stood*?" Is that the natural attitude of a mourner, and such a mourner as a mother, present at the torturing death of her only son? No; though Mary was indeed a mourner, and endured grief such as no other mother ever knew, for her Son whom she beheld expiring was her God also. Yet is she present there as no common mourner. She is standing: she is performing an act second only in greatness to that which her Son is effecting on the cross. She is offering an oblation; she is generously giving up that Son to die; she is consenting to all his tortures, while her own soul is crucified with Him. Yes; Mary gave Him up to the scourges, to the blows, to the scorn and insults of his executioners. She gave Him up to be crowned with thorns. "Go forth, and see King Solomon in the diadem wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals" (Cant. iii. 11); the day on which He espoused us to Himself upon the cross. Mary consents to this cruel crowning. She consents to his five wounds; and the agony of the last, the piercing of his sacred side, she bears herself alone. Oh, love immense, unutterable!

Mary then consented of her own free will to forego the joys of heaven, at the right hand of her Son, for many years, that she might be a nursing mother to the infant Church. It is not known with certainty how long she remained on earth. The shortest account seems to make it eleven or twelve years, the longest twenty-one; any how, it was a prolonged martyrdom of love to a soul, whose intense longing to be with Jesus would have caused it to burst the bonds that held it to the flesh, had not a continual miracle preserved that union. Mary must have been sixty, or nearly seventy years old, at the time of her death, but no marks of age were visible in her. Her countenance still shone with the same heavenly beauty. St.

Dionysius the Areopagite, who saw her at this advanced period of life, has left us his testimony to this fact; and he states also, that so impressed was he by her supernatural loveliness and majesty the first time he beheld her, that had he not been illuminated by the true faith, he must have adored her as a divinity. We have no reason to feel surprised that age left no traces on the countenance of the blessed Virgin, when we remember that death had really no claims upon her. Infirmities and death are the penalty of Adam's transgression, from an inherited share in which Mary, by a divine decree, had been exempted from all eternity. Neither did the same reason exist to make her death needful, as in the case of her divine Son, who suffered death in order to redeem us by his blood. Nevertheless, Mary desired in all things to conform herself to his pattern, and to taste of death, in order to be the more like to Him, though she had indeed already tasted the bitterness of ten thousand deaths at the foot of his cross.

An angel was sent from heaven,—one of those many exalted spirits who waited on their Queen, and, as is generally believed, the blessed St. Gabriel himself—to acquaint Mary with the day and hour on which her Son would call her to Himself. With what jubilee of heart must our holy Mother have received the joyful tidings! yet submission to the divine will surmounted every other feeling in this most humble and purest of hearts. “Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word:” doubtless such again was the most holy Virgin's reply. As the day drew near, when the “ark of the New Testament,” holy Mary, was to be exalted into the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem, with greater glory and pomp than that with which her type, the ark of the Old Testament, was brought by King Solomon into the sanctuary, the Mother of God visited once more the holy places where her Son had suffered, for the last time treading the way of the cross, and kissing the ground which the blood of Jesus had made dear and sacred to her heart; and after committing it to angelic guardianship, she returned to the *coenaculum*, where she abode with St. John ever since. With him she had returned to Jerusalem from Ephesus, where the beloved apostle had laboured many years. The *coenaculum*, where Jesus instituted that festival of love, and first gave his body and blood to feed his Church, was to be the scene of Mary's glorious passage, itself a triumph of love; for it was love alone which separated her blessed soul from her body. And now the Apostles and many disciples congregated together from all parts of the world, brought by the ministry of angels, or moved by sudden inspiration to repair to Jerusalem. See our holy

Mother surrounded by her weeping children; for the joy they felt at her exaltation could not repress in them their grief at losing her sweet presence. It was to lose Jesus, as it were, a second time.

Mary reclined upon a low couch: it was not that any mortal sickness assailed her, but the tie which bound her soul to her body was failing, as its aspirations of love became more fervent, and God was withdrawing that miraculous interposition which had held them united. She addressed her children, she told them of the mother's love she bore them, and ever should bear them in her glory, as in the land of her exile. She commended to them the Church of God, which Jesus had purchased with his own blood, and bade them love one another as He had given them commandment; and while the Apostles listened in tears, as Mary repeated to them the last injunctions of her Son, the hour drew nigh when Jesus gave up his spirit into the hands of his Father. All present, as St. Jerome attests, heard the heavenly host singing canticles and hymns round the Mother of God, while Mary, leaning back on her couch, and joining her hands, her face all inflamed with divine love, kept her eyes fixed upon her Son, who, unseen by the disciples, had descended from heaven to receive her, awaiting his call to depart. Then, after his example on the cross, commending her soul into the hands of her Lord, she closed her virginal eyes and expired. Her most pure soul passed in the same instant into the bosom of God, and was placed in glory far above cherubim and seraphim, at the right hand of her blessed Son. The cœnaculum which contained her sacred body was filled with a heavenly fragrance and a supernatural brightness as Mary's soul departed; without daring to touch the sacred body of the Virgin of virgins, which they revered as the tabernacle of God, the sorrowing Apostles placed upon a bier the couch on which she rested, covered it with a gorgeous veil, and bore it to the valley of Jehoshaphat to inter it. Crowds of the faithful followed, bearing lighted torches, and chanting hymns; but there was an invisible multitude also in the air swelling the harmony with their angelic voices, as they accompanied the body of their Queen. The women of Jerusalem had adorned the sepulchre with roses, which, like that of her blessed Son's, was hewn out of a rock, and closed with a stone, and here, amidst the sobs and tears of her faithful children, the Virgin Mother of God was laid.

The Apostles watched day and night at the tomb till the third day, and all that time the angelic harmony continued. On the third day it ceased; and the Apostles, taught by the Spirit of God confidently to expect the wonder which had

taken place, opened the sepulchre when the angelic songs were no longer heard, and there they found, not the body of Mary, but only the tunic which had covered her holy body, and the veil, and the couch, and the flowers which had been scattered round the bier. Jesus had descended from heaven with his blessed Mother at the hour of his own resurrection, attended by innumerable angels and a glorious company of the ancient fathers and prophets. Arrived in the valley of Jehoshaphat, Jesus bade the soul of his holy Mother re-enter and re-animate her body, which instantly arose from the grave enriched with all the gifts, and adorned with all the splendour, of its now immortal and glorious existence. But as the splendour of the glorified body is proportioned to the gifts of grace which the soul possesses, what must have been the surpassing brightness of the risen glory of Mary! Oh, with what triumphant joy did the angels and the blessed salute their incomparable Queen! and in what rapturous songs of thanksgiving must her blessed parents, St. Joachim and St. Anne, and her holy spouse St. Joseph especially, have burst forth, magnifying God for this his crowning work! The procession moved on towards heaven, the Queen in a vesture of gold more splendid than ten thousand suns at the right hand of the King, and so they entered into the highest heaven, the angels singing, "Who is this that cometh up from the desert flowing with delights, leaning upon her Beloved?" (Cant. viii. 5.) "Who is she that cometh forth as the morning, rising fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array?" (vi. 9.) But what was the ineffable joy with which Mary's most holy soul and body were inundated! The language of the Canticles, where Christ is foreshadowed in the person of the Beloved as addressing his blessed Mother, may best suggest to us thoughts which are above words. "Behold, my Beloved speaketh to me: Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one, and come. For winter is now past, the rain is over and gone. The flowers have appeared in our land; the voice of the turtle is heard; the vines in flower yield their sweet smell. Arise, my love, my beautiful one, and come" (ii. 10-13). Yes, the glory, and freshness, and beauty, and fragrance of a summer morn are fittest types of the resurrection of that which eye hath not seen, nor can the heart of man as yet comprehend, and of hers especially, who was herself like a new moon arising. Images drawn from nature God himself has supplied us with to describe heavenly things, and they speak to us a deeper and a fuller language than our own tongues can frame.

It is painful to a Catholic to descend from such high and sweet thoughts, from the contemplation by faith of heavenly

mysteries, to the task of offering any thing of the nature of dry proof addressed to the reason, proof so often unsatisfactory, not because there is not enough to satisfy the reason, but because the heart is not disposed to accept it. Nor is it our intention to attempt any thing of the kind. We would merely suggest one fact to the consideration of Protestants, by way of evidence, that the assumption of the body of the blessed Virgin has been the pious belief of the Church from the very beginning. How is it that among the innumerable relics which have been preserved from the earliest times, among which are relics of the bodies of the holy Apostles themselves, that none whatsoever of the body of the most holy Virgin exist? Protestants will answer perhaps, for it is easy to assert any thing, that these early relics are fictitious, or that no sufficient proof exists of their genuineness. Well, this makes nothing to my argument. How is it that Catholics have never *pretended* to possess the smallest relic of the body of the Mother of God? Does not this at least testify to a prevailing belief, descending from apostolic times, in the fact we have been setting before you?

Perhaps, however, our readers' minds may have taken a different turn, and we can fancy we hear them object, as Protestants often do, "You raise Mary so high, that you make her like God. And this is to take from his honour and glory." Well, we make Mary like God, very true; and we will say much more, all the blessed are like God; and we are quite sure that what Catholics believe of the glory of that soul which occupies the lowest place in heaven, would shock Protestants if ascribed to the Mother of God herself. Yes; Mary is not only like God, but she is very like Him, exceedingly like Him, as like as any thing can be to that which it *is not*. For reflect a little on this word *like*: the word is used here to express only similitude, not equality; indeed it cannot by possibility have any other meaning. Of course, when we speak of created things, likeness may imply equality and oneness of nature, as well as similitude. In this sense, it is needless to say that God has not his like, or there would be more Gods than one. The word, therefore, means here similitude in a very perfect degree; neither are we aware that the most ignorant or most bigoted Protestant seriously accuses us of asserting any thing more. They say we make Mary too much like God, not that we believe her essentially to *be* God. Now that which is like a thing is not, by the very meaning of the word, that which it resembles. What, then, is God, and what is the difference between Him and the work of his hands? God is the eternal, infinite, self-existing Being; his own beginning and his own

end; infinite in all perfections; giving to all, and receiving from none; uncircumscribed by time, or space, or limit. Now the difference between God and his creatures does not exist in that *they* are little, and that He is very great and raised far above them in degree, so as that by raising them you would indefinitely diminish that distance, and so are constrained to keep them small, that you may keep Him great. This is a false, unworthy, heathen notion of God. God and his creatures cannot be measured by each other; their highest exaltation cannot trench upon his prerogatives. Let the similitude between Mary and her blessed Son be beyond expression perfect, as indeed it is, yet it still remains that He *is* the uncreated God, while Mary is a creature, though the purest and most exalted of creatures. No creature can become what essentially it is not; and when we say that even God cannot make it so, we do not mean to limit his omnipotence, but simply to assert that the thing is a self-contradiction. That which from its created nature must receive every thing in the degree in which it is communicated, cannot become that which by its nature is self-existent and infinite in all things. True, the blessed are all made "partakers of the divine nature," as St. Peter says (2 Peter i. 4); and Mary pre-eminently so from her high dignity and relationship to the most holy Trinity; but they are partakers of it *by grace*, they cannot become personally God, or essentially possessed of the divine nature, which in this sense is incommunicable.

So far, then, from its being any disparagement to the divine honour to say that Mary is like to God, it is to detract from his honour to deny Him the power of creating a glorious being so like to Himself. Protestants have to learn what God is. They have to fathom by faith the depth of those words, 'infinite' and 'self-existing.' They have to learn that the finite cannot be compared to the infinite, any more than time can be compared to eternity. The utmost prolongation of time does not diminish the difference. An instant of time bears precisely the same proportion to eternity as millions of ages do; that is, neither bear any at all. Self-existence, again, is an idea which excludes comparison. It is a state which can neither be approached by-degrees nor imparted to any thing or person.

Once, therefore, realise what God is, and you will understand that his glory and greatness are unapproachable, and that the ineffable height and resemblance to Himself to which He has raised his holy Mother, do but magnify that glory and exalt his own most holy and ever-blessed name.

Review.

DOMESTIC GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.

Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England, from the Conquest to the end of the Thirteenth Century; with numerous Illustrations of existing Remains, from Original Drawings. By T. Hudson Turner. Oxford, J. H. Parker.

"AFTER all, there's nothing like a good, plain, old-fashioned, square house for comfort and convenience. Keep your Gothic and your gables for churches and schools; for a place to *live in*, give me the sort of building that suited my father and grandfather, before these new notions got abroad." So says the simple-minded householder, bewildered by the doings of architectural societies, mediævalists, and unmanageable architects, and the nooks and crannies of some outrageous piece of "Gothic" irregularity. "I, for my part," says another, more discriminating and æsthetical, "I like to see a church look as unlike a house as possible. I don't like to see the same candlesticks on the altar and on the dining-room table. Gothic is 'ecclesiastical,' and I would keep it sacred from all secular associations. When I go into a church, I don't want to be reminded of my drawing-room furniture; and when I sit down to dinner, I don't want to be made to feel as if I was going to say my prayers."

Who has not heard these remarks, or such as these, again and again, during the last ten or fifteen years? Who has not observed that nineteen people out of every twenty are firmly convinced that a Gothic house is necessarily expensive, beautiful, and inconvenient, and an Italian house necessarily cheap, ugly, and comfortable; and that it is a violation of all the laws of art and religion to make a dining-room resemble a church? Yet a few minutes of thought on the real peculiarities of Gothic architecture as employed for domestic purposes would, we are persuaded, do more for the cultivation of both Gothic and Italian domestic art, than all the rigid separation which many would draw between the two styles, whether on grounds of comfort or of propriety.

To those who conceive that Gothic architecture is inherently unsuitable for houses, and that our forefathers never made a house or a part of a house look like a church, we should suggest the perusal of Mr. Hudson Turner's very valuable book now before us. Open the volume, for instance, at the title-page, observe the frontispiece, placing your hand

over the words at the foot of the engraving, and ask yourself *what* that building is which it represents? "It is a Norman church," would be the exclamation of almost every one. "What a pretty engraving! what graceful columns and arches! what a nice, simple, open roof! It is quite a model for our young church-architects." Lift up your hand, then, and read—"Hall of Oakham Castle." It is nothing else than a dining-room of the twelfth century. But the exterior—surely *that* shews its destination. Turn, then, to Mr Turner's book at page 28. Again, quite a model for a village church; the nave and aisles distinctly marked; a high pitched roof, divided into three parts, with a kind of embryo clerestory; every thing as "ecclesiastical" as can be conceived. Such were the ideas of architects in the twelfth century as to dining-halls.

Or would you select some pleasing example of a pointed window of a somewhat later date, for insertion in a church, chapel, or oratory, as unlike as possible to any thing that now appears in domestic buildings? Mr. Turner's illustrations will supply your needs. From Little Wenham Hall, Suffolk, or Stoke Say or Acton Burnell, Shropshire, you may choose as perfect specimens of pointed windows as the most critical taste can desire. Go where you will, you will perceive that the theory, that the architecture and decorations of a church, and a house ought to be *essentially* unlike in style, is a theory of the most modern days; the progeny of an eclectic, shallow, unreal age like our own. When Gothic architecture was a living, natural *art*, architects built just what was wanted by their employers, consulting common sense and good taste, undeterred by the frowns of sciolist critics, and unshaken by the prancing of any hobby-horses stalled and fed in museums and libraries.

"All this, however," it will be suggested by the modern housebuilder, "has nothing to do with the question as to the *convenience* and *economy* of Gothic architecture for domestic use. What is it to me that in the 13th century they built their dining-rooms like churches, and filled their churches with furniture just like their private furniture, if now, while a Gothic church is as cheap and handsome as an Italian church, a Gothic house is dear, inconvenient, and uncomfortable?" Nothing, indeed, it must be replied. If there really *is* any inherent impossibility in adapting Gothic architecture to modern private needs, it is simply trifling to seek to force it on a man against his own feelings as to what he likes and what he can pay for. We think, however, that, with certain exceptions, no such inherent impossibility exists; and that the

most fastidious of English "comfortables," and the most rigid of all economists, will sometimes find a Gothic house answer their purpose even better than an Italian one. Of course we speak of persons who have some regard for the beauty of their habitations. If a man is equally satisfied with ugliness and beauty, by all means let him eschew Gothic for ever. If he has literally *no* taste, a square brick house, without the slightest pretensions to either Gothic or Italian art, is the standard of perfection for him. The question concerns only those to whom beauty of appearance, comfort and convenience, and (more or less) economy, are points to be taken into consideration. And bearing these three desiderata in mind, we think the whole question of Gothic or Italian lies in a nut-shell. If cheapness alone is to decide, as we have said, Gothic is out of the question. If comfort alone is to decide, Gothic is likewise to be rejected. If internal appearance is to be consulted, in company with comfort in its highest degree, a Gothic house will fail in giving satisfaction. If external appearance in conjunction with economy is to govern the design, then Gothic is the right style. If the great object of the builder is to look out upon a beautiful prospect, Gothic must be rejected. If economy is no object at all, and a degree of comfort less than the highest will suffice, then Gothic will give as much satisfaction as Italian. But if we desire to combine *all* the usual merits in a house, without insisting on the absolute predominance of any one above the rest, and to draw as lightly as may be upon our purse for its cost, then, in our judgment, Gothic will answer our purpose *better* than Italian.

We found these opinions on the following facts: First, a moderate degree of embellishment can be attained in Gothic architecture at a much lower cost than in Italian. The breaking of the outlines by gables, and projections of various kinds unknown to small Italian buildings, gives a degree of that light and shade which is essential to beauty; and the mullions of the simplest Gothic window in themselves give an ornamental character to the plainest of all buildings. An Italian window *unornamented* is the abomination of ugliness; and to ornament it properly costs a considerable sum. So, too, with the general external features of a house: an equal amount of grace, richness, or picturesqueness, can be attained by the natural construction of Gothic buildings at a much lower cost than in an Italian edifice. Within doors the case is altered. So far as comfort is concerned, the sash-window carries it hollow over the best of casements. Even when the workmanship and materials are first-rate, and consequently very expensive, the casement is less air-tight and water-tight than an ordi-

narily constructed sash; and it has the disadvantage of either opening inwards, to the total discomfiture of blinds and curtains, or of opening outwards, to be warped and dirtied by the rain and dust. The mullions also of a Gothic window spoil the view, if we wish to look out upon a noble landscape or a fair garden; and in hot weather they do not let the air in so abundantly as the plain sash. For ensuring mere *comfort*, therefore, in its highest degree, Gothic windows fail. At the same time, good workmanship will make them quite tolerable for those who are easily satisfied; and as improving the internal *beauty* of a room, irrespective of the prospect without, their superiority is undeniable. A handsome Gothic window, whether a bay-window, square-headed, or pointed, is the cheapest and most *telling* ornament that a room can enjoy.

As to the *general* convenience of the two styles, there is not the slightest difference between them. There are no laws, either Gothic or Italian, which prescribe the position of rooms, their shape or size, the width of the passages, the amount of light to be admitted, or any one of those details which make a house a desirable residence or the reverse. When a Gothic house is inconvenient and gloomy, it is the architect's fault, who consulted his own crotchets instead of the dictates of art and common sense.

One special merit in the way of convenience which belongs to Gothic architecture must not be forgotten. A Gothic house can be altered or added to without limit, without fear of spoiling the original design; and in its first construction we are bound by none of those worrying rules requiring us to make one part answer another, which, when economy is an object, so often compel us to sacrifice one half of a house to the other half.

To all who are interested in the subject, we recommend Mr. Turner's volume. It is full of important information, both on the architectural peculiarities of English buildings down to the thirteenth century, and on many of those particulars in domestic and social life which gave to the buildings of the day their distinctive features. He has amassed together a great number of facts, and put them together in an agreeable and unpretending style; and his illustrations, which are numerous and well executed, contribute to make the work the best at present existing on the subject of which he treats.

SHORT NOTICES.

THOSE of our readers who are interested in the subject of the Roman Catacombs, and indeed of Christian antiquities generally, will be glad to hear that Father Marchi has resumed his duties as curator of those venerable cemeteries, and that the learned and zealous Cavaliere de Rossi has been appointed to assist him in this office. They have just published in a recent number of the *Civiltà Cattolica* a short report of their labours during the last six months, from which it appears that that invaluable treasure-house of memorials of the early Church is still far from being exhausted. Besides the coins and medals, and ornaments cut in precious stone, which they have found, and which would be interesting to all antiquarians, they have also brought to light many sacred pictures that were before unknown, and upwards of two hundred Christian inscriptions, some of which are of very special value to the student of Christian antiquity. One in particular contains a distinct acknowledgment of the divinity of Christ, which, as is well known to all who are familiar with the subject, is very rarely to be met with in this class of monuments. In the present inscription, found in the cemetery of San Sisto, and still suffered to remain there, our Lord is intitled CHRIST GOD ALMIGHTY; and the same inscription contains (as so many others also of those ancient epitaphs) a petition for the departed soul: which implies the doctrine of purgatory, "May Christ God Almighty refresh thy spirit."

We wish we could add that Father Marchi had announced his intention of resuming and completing his large and important work on subterranean Rome; but he has not: and we fear we must augur from this silence that he finds himself unable to do so; that is, that he cannot find a publisher willing to undertake the risk. These apprehensions are confirmed, too, by observing that he announces a periodical publication upon Christian monuments, of a somewhat different character.

If the view taken by the Bishop of Rochelle of the share of Henry VIII. in the celebrated *Defence of the Seven Sacraments* (Angers, Lainé Frères) be correct, Queen Victoria's title of "Defender of the Faith" is not only now a falsehood, but was originally founded on a fraud. To a newly-published French translation, by M. Pottier, of the "Defence," the Bishop has prefixed an introduction, shewing clearly the very strong grounds which exist for believing that the great Bishop Fisher was the real author, and that the king passed it off upon Leo X. as his own composition. It is well known that the treatise possesses much intrinsic merit, and M. Pottier has presented a worthy offering to the Catholic's library. The volume contains the original Latin text as well as the French translation, and the older editions being extremely scarce, the publication altogether will be welcome in many countries besides France.

Father Newman's *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* (Burns and Lambert) are in course of publication as they are delivered. Those who have detected in Father Newman's previous works the extraordinary power of keen and argumentative satire which lies hid in so many of his works, will not be surprised at the pictures of Protestantism presented on an occasion which allowed the lecturer free scope for his gift.

To all who are interested in the question of the education of the young—and who is not?—we strongly recommend the study of Mr. Robert Gordon's translation of *Stapf's Spirit and Scope of Education* (Marsh and Beattie). No Catholic book on the subject exists in our own language which attempts to treat on education with any thing like the fulness and the acuteness of Dr. Stapf's essay. Of course, in a book embracing so many details, there may be room for differences of opinion on certain points; but allowing for the largest latitude of dissent, the work will be of no little value to every Catholic who would study *the great subject of the age*. We shall hope to return to it on a future occasion.

The Rev. Paul MacLachlan's volume, *The Bible, its Use and Abuse* (Dolman), is a magazine of historical facts on the results of Protestantism in the abuse of the Scriptures. It will be found very useful for circulation among some classes of Protestants, by way of predisposing them to a more candid inquiry into the claims of the Catholic Church on their obedience. It is also a good book for a Catholic lending-library.

The excellent series of the *Clifton Tracts* (Burns and Lambert) goes on with undiminished vigour. The series on *Rites and Ceremonies* promises to be as amusing as it is acute and profound.

The fifth series of D. C. L.'s clever *Letters on Church Matters*, reprinted from the *Morning Chronicle* (Ridgway), continues the same *exposé* of the wretchedness of Protestantism, which the learned writer accomplishes with such gusto and such unconsciousness of the absurdities of which he is convicting himself in almost every sentence that he writes.

Rare as original English Catholic writings are on any thing like a subject of doctrine, we are glad to welcome the publication of Mr. Stothert's lectures entitled *The Glory of Mary in conformity with the Word of God* (Dolman), originally delivered in the church to which the author is attached in Edinburgh. Their style is refined and devout, and the matter far above commonplace.

Mr. Oakeley's *Few Words of Affection and Congratulation addressed to his Fellow-Converts before the Mass of Thanksgiving for the Conversions to the Church at St. John's, Islington, on the Octave of the Ascension* (Burns and Lambert), is scarcely a subject for criticism. They are exactly what their title expresses, and full of feeling and gratitude to Almighty God for that inestimable blessing which, after all, no words *can* describe.

Mr. Maclachlan's *Catholicism one in Principle and tolerant in Practice* (Glasgow, Margey), cleverly answers the misrepresentations of Mr. Alison, the rector of Glasgow University; but we think it rather overstates the "toleration" practised by the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Vindicator is a very cheap weekly Catholic publication, bearing more of the character of a newspaper than the *Lamp*. It contains a good deal of information interesting to the class of persons among whom it is intended to circulate. We wish it all the success it deserves.

Something on Ruskinism, by an Architect (Hastings), is more personal than witty. Mr. Ruskin has vagaries enough to tempt the satirist, but he has not much to fear from the writer of the squib before us.

Correspondence.

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PASSION OF OUR BLESSED LORD IN FRANCE.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

DEAR SIR,—I think the following extract from a private letter, written by a Father of the Society of Jesus during Easter week in the present year, cannot fail to be interesting to those of your readers to whom, as to myself, the account of "the Mystery of the Passion at Ober Ammergau in Bavaria," as related in your June number, was altogether new. I may as well mention that the writer is a Frenchman, though he writes our language so correctly that few of your readers would have suspected it.

N.

Vals, 24th April, 1851.

"I have just been giving a retreat during Holy Week in a small town called Pradilly, about twenty miles from Le Puy. Although the retreat lasted only for a week, we could nevertheless, although with much more labour, do every thing which we could have done in a longer space of time; and the usual ceremonies of Holy Week, which are there performed with great solemnity, contributed very much to the success of the mission. As for the retreat itself, I shall only say, that from the very first day to the last the church was crowded to excess, such is the power of the grace of the jubilee on those good mountaineers; although it cannot be denied that, for the last two years, great havoc has been made among them by the bad newspapers which are gratuitously circulated in the country. . . . Besides the usual ceremonies, which never fail to draw to the church many people who otherwise would never avail themselves of the benefit of the retreat, and

which besides have the advantage, by striking the senses, of disposing people's minds to yield to the power of divine truth, we were (as I said before) greatly assisted by the ceremonies of Holy Week performed there, as they pretty generally are in this country, though I had never seen them surrounded with such solemnity. In witnessing them I often thought how ridiculous all that would appear to the eyes of any English Protestant, although even they, I am sure, could not help being strongly impressed by the deep faith and piety which breathed from every face. I do not know whether you have ever heard of the confraternities of *Penitents*, which are very common in the south of France. They have been instituted to serve as a sort of escort to the blessed Sacrament, and to perform several services in its honour. Their rules are very good, but unhappily they are not generally very well observed. In many instances, however, these confraternities have a very beneficial result in increasing the solemnity of divine service. At Pradilly there is particularly among them a great emulation for the performance of the ceremonies of Holy Week. Besides matins, and the other usual offices of the Church, which are gone through with the greatest pomp which the place can afford, on Maundy Thursday the rector of the confraternity, together with his assistants, washes the feet of twelve of his brethren, and then gives to every one a loaf of bread and a draught of wine. But the most interesting sight is reserved for the evening of the same day, when the whole confraternity walks in procession after nightfall, most of them bearing torches and lanterns, and the others carrying the instruments of the Passion of our Saviour. The effect of the scene is striking and touching to a very high degree. All the windows of the town are illuminated; and the whole population lines the streets, in the posture of the greatest recollection, to see those living representations of the sufferings of our Saviour passing before their eyes. All the Penitents are dressed in white gowns, which cover them entirely from head to foot, with only two narrow apertures for the eyes; and it is a great point in their rules to conceal themselves so that nobody may know them. In the present instance the darkness of the night, and the pallid glare of the torches and lanterns reflected by their white gowns, still more increased the mysterious appearance of such a procession, and impressed the crowd of spectators with a feeling of awe. But that feeling was changed into one of veneration when they saw one of those who represented our Saviour, or carried one of the instruments of his Passion. I cannot give you the details of those different representations. Nothing was omitted, from the rope with which He was tied, to the spear with which his blessed side was pierced; and to render the sight more impressive, all those who had obtained the privilege of carrying those instruments contrived to do it in the most inconvenient possible way. Thus he who bore the chalice held it raised as high as possible over his head. But the task of those who represented the person of our Saviour, either dragged from one tribunal to another, or tied to the column, or crowned with thorns, was still more painful. These always walk barefooted, be the soil (as it very often is) covered with mud, with ice, or with snow; and although, on several occasions, some of them have got serious diseases from such a perilous performance, that painful honour is every year the object of a very keen competition. You cannot imagine the devotion with which all the people kneel down when one of those living images of their God come near them; but nothing can surpass their emotion when they see the last scene of the procession, which is indeed exceedingly touching. It is the representation of our Saviour carrying his cross. The cross, which is a very heavy one, is

tied with strong ropes on the shoulders of him who represents our Saviour, and, as if that were not enough to tire him, he genuflects at every step. I assure you that, for a population full of faith and simplicity, such a ceremony, accompanied as it is with the singing of the hymns of the Church by hundreds of manly voices, appears to me far better calculated than any sermon to fill them with devotion for the sufferings of our Saviour. At the end of our retreat we had another solemn procession, in honour of the Blessed Virgin, to a chapel where a miraculous statue is honoured, which has been for many hundred years the object of a pilgrimage formerly very much frequented, and still in great honour in the whole country. This time the scene was of a different description. The Penitents still were there, but along with them were the other pious confraternities of the town, with their various dresses and their banners, the *gendarmes*, the firemen with their military apparel and their drums, the mayor and corporation, and all the clergy which we could gather from the neighbourhood. I assure you that all those different costumes and banners arranged around the altar of the Blessed Virgin, which was more splendidly lighted with hundreds of candles and lamps, and better adorned with flowers, than could have been expected from such a small town, presented a very beautiful sight; and it was not necessary to be very eloquent to draw tears from the eyes of those good people, who, comparing what they were now with what they had been some days before, could hardly believe that such a change could so rapidly have taken place."

THE ANGELUS BELL.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

DEAR SIR,—I wish to ask two questions with regard to the *Angelus* bell: (1) *when*, (2) *how*, it ought to be rung.

(1.) In Rome, at the end of the *Ordo*, a list is given of the times at which the evening *Angelus* is to be rung, which varying time goes by the name of the *Ave Maria*. It is a quarter of an hour after sunset, or thereabouts. It rings at 5 o'clock from November 20 to December 28, and at a quarter past 8 from June 11 to July 15. At an hour after the *Ave Maria*, the bell rings for the *De Profundis*: this is called 'one hour of night.' And in some parts of Italy the bell rings one hour before the *Ave Maria*, at twenty-three o'clock, for the *Credo*. So much for the evening *Angelus*. I do not know when the morning *Angelus* rings, that is, what relation it has to the aurora; but it rings in some places as early as four, at others as late as six. At midday, of course, the *Angelus* is always rung all the year round. I write now to ask (a) What rule guides them in Italy for the morning *Angelus*? (b) Do we do right in England in ringing the morning and evening bells at a fixed time all the year through, as at six and six, or five and seven. Six o'clock is night-time in winter, and broad day-light in summer, and only twice a-year does it coincide with the Roman idea of the *Ave Serotinum*; and only twice a-year would the *De Profundis*, rung an hour after the *Angelus*, be 'one hour of night.' The *Raccolta* says, quoting Pope Benedict XIII., *la sera dopo tramontato il sole*. I wonder whether anywhere in England at this time of the year the *Angelus* is rung *after sunset*.

(2.) In Rome, if I remember rightly, the *Angelus* is rung thus: three strokes, four strokes, five strokes, one stroke; which on feast-days and their eves is followed by a peal. I think that in this I am

right, because I remember the Dogmatic Professor at S. Apollinare, in the *De Trinitate*, giving us, as a sort of *memoria technica*, the ringing of the *Angelus* for the *three* persons, *four* relationships, *five* notions, and *one* nature, in the Blessed Trinity. I think the usual English way is three threes. But whence this fashion is derived I do not know; and I cannot but think that it would be much better, especially if we hope for uniformity in such matters, that these things should all be done by us as they are done at Rome.

Let me also remark, that the *Raccolta* says, that Pius VI. determined that the faithful who were in places where the bell does not ring can gain the indulgences by saying the *Angelus*, or *Regina Cæli*, about the proper time (*circa le ore determinate*).

I ought to have added, that in Italy the *Regina Cæli*, *Credo*, and *De Profundis* are rung in the same way as the *Angelus*.

It is a mistake to say the *Angelus* of Saturday mid-day standing, even in Lent. Martinucci, one of the Pope's masters of ceremonies, and the editor of the very useful *Manuale Ecclesiasticorum* (Rome, 1845), has an interesting article on the subject. *Manuale Eccl.* No. 424.

Yours obediently,

J. M.

ON THE DISPOSAL OF THE ABLUTIONS WHEN DUPLICATING.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Will you be so good as to give this question a place in your "Priest's Portfolio" when you have room.

What is the rule about the ablutions when duplicating? The following is my own *praxis*, but I do not know that it is authorised by any *littera scripta*. I. If the second Mass is to be said in the same church, I replace the chalice on the corporal, put upon it the purificator, paten, and pall, and spread over all the veil, saying, meanwhile, *Quod ore* and *Corpus tuum*. I then dip my fingers in the vessel prepared for communions out of Mass. Before I come to say the second Mass, I place a Host upon the paten. In the second Mass I do not remove the chalice from the corporal for the wine and water, nor do I cleanse it with the purificator before the offertory. I think it well to use as the ablution for the second Mass the water used as a purification in the first. II. When the second Mass is said in another church, immediately after the Communion I place the chalice, with its purificator, paten, and pall, in the tabernacle; fold the corporal up, put it into the burse, and leave burse and veil on the altar. When I return next to say Mass at the same altar, and am ready vested, when the candles are lighted, I open the tabernacle for my chalice, place it on the corporal, put a Host on the paten, and proceed as above.

I look upon the plan of pouring the ablutions into a phial, and carrying them with you, as unsightly, all but disrespectful; and dangerous, both on account of the danger of spilling in pouring from the chalice into a narrow-necked bottle, and of the possibility of some of the sacred species adhering to the glass. I should only think of using it when there was no tabernacle in which to leave the chalice.

If there is no law on the subject, what is the ordinary practice?

S.

Ecclesiastical Register.

LODGING-HOUSES FOR THE CATHOLIC POOR.

THE following is the prospectus of an Institution just opened by Mr. Bennett in one of the most densely-populated districts of London. Its support cannot be too earnestly recommended to all classes of Catholics.

"The Working Man's Institution, opened at No. 2 Mill Lane, Tooley Street, is intended as the commencement of a general association of the Catholic labouring classes in London, for their mutual benefit, and their social, moral, and religious improvement.

"None but Catholics of good character will be admitted as lodgers, and it is hoped that they will co-operate with the other members of the congregation in forming themselves into a district association for aiding each other and the labouring classes generally in procuring employment, and for assisting strangers and others, whether male or female, who have no homes of their own, in finding respectable lodgings; so that this institution will by no means be the rival, but rather an auxiliary, to other well-conducted lodging-houses, for the district association will always be prepared to recommend good lodgings to those who want them; and thus, as the institution becomes known, it is probable that clergymen in Ireland and other places will recommend well-disposed members of their congregations, who may be coming to London, to apply to this institution, which will thus become a kind of agency to procure respectable lodgings for strangers. It is to be hoped that, as similar institutions may be established in all the London districts, the whole Catholic labouring class will, by means of periodical meetings of committees from each district, be united into one great institution, associated for mutual support and the good of religion.

"The institution is also intended to afford facilities for instruction and rational amusement, by encouraging meetings of Catholic societies for the working classes, where singing and innocent games will take place, and where it is hoped that some zealous Catholic gentlemen will give lectures on various instructive subjects. There is a comfortable well-lighted reading-room, which, if supported, will be well supplied with all Catholic newspapers and periodicals, and with the daily London papers, and it is hoped that a district library will soon be formed as a part of the institution.

"Besides the lodging-house and reading-room, there is also a handsome coffee and dining-room, where any one can have breakfast, dinner, tea, or supper, at prices far below those charged at other eating-houses for the same quality of provisions; and a soup-kitchen, from which the best soups are supplied to families who send for them, at less than they can possibly be made for at their own homes, with a great saving to the women of labour and fuel. It is only, however, by very extensive support that the extremely low prices will pay; and as this support, involving no pecuniary sacrifice on the part of the Catholics, is absolutely necessary for the success of this the establishment as a self-supporting institution, there surely cannot be any doubt of its being given for the purpose of establishing an institution which will be the means of so great social advantages to the working classes, improving their dwellings, withdrawing many from bad companions and from the public-houses, combining them in harmonious union for mutual benefit and the good of religion, and supplying them with better and cheaper food,

thereby increasing their own comfort and their means of doing good to others."

An association of ladies is raising funds for the establishment of another somewhat similar institution, by which lodgings will be found for fifty poor Catholic families, in immediate connexion with the Oratory in King William Street, London.

BRIEF OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS IX.,

PLACING ST. HILARY OF POITIERS IN THE RANK OF THE DOCTORS
OF THE CHURCH.

PIUS PP. IX.

For a Perpetual Remembrance of the Thing.

IF from the very earliest times of the Church the enemy hath not ceased to over-sow cockle in the field of the Lord,—that is to say, by the help of the heretics to propagate false doctrine,—nevertheless God, most provident, who had promised that He will be with his Church until the consummation of the world, hath raised up illustrious men to pierce, as it were, with the most mighty weapons of holiness and learning the monsters of heresy wandering about, and with the light of truth to dissipate the widely-diffused clouds of errors. Certainly, when the Arian heresy burst forth, than which no pestilence more horrible has ever been spread abroad to the ruin of souls, besides Athanasius and other unconquered heroes, Hilary Bishop of Poitiers sharpened his pen against that heresy, and by the wise writings he published, vindicated the divinity of Christ from the blasphemies of Arius. He, in Gaul, stood forth like a tower to resist the fury of the Arians; he transfixed with an anathema Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, a follower of the impious doctrine; as also Arsacius and Valens, standard-bearers of the heretics, by whose means chiefly he, being driven into exile, relaxed nothing of his zeal and alacrity in the assertion of Catholic truth, inasmuch as when banished into Phrygia, he, in nowise shaken by the sorrows of exile, put forth his admirable works *De Synodis* and *De Trinitate*. Afterwards, when he was present at Seleucia, at a synod of the Eastern Bishops, where he defended the integrity of the faith of the Bishops of the West, he proceeded to Constantinople, where the Arian Bishops had assembled together, that he might defend the same faith before Constantine. Moreover, he bravely and zealously asked leave of the emperor publicly to dispute with Saturninus of Arles, who nevertheless, with his partisans, dreading the learning of the holy Bishop, did along with them, on pretence of the disturbances which they said were arising throughout the East because of Hilarius, persuade the emperor to send him back to his diocese. Then the Church of Gaul embraced Hilarius on his return from the conflict with the heretics, the defender of the Catholic doctrine; and being restored to his flock, zealously exerted himself, and succeeded in the object of deposing Saturninus of Arles and Fortunatus of Périgueux, which bishop being removed and deposed, the whole of Gaul rid itself of the Arian poison.

Since Hilary did so many and such great things for the Catholic faith, it is not wonderful that he gained the praises of the most learned of the Fathers. For of him Jerome attests that, "by the merit of his confession, and the industry of his life, and the brightness of his eloquence, he is everywhere praised, and his books may be perused without finding a line in them to offend." Him Augustine calls "the most acute defender of the Catholic Church against the heretics." Nay, in

refuting the Pelagians by the doctrine of Hilary, he says these words: "So speaks the Catholic, so speaks the Doctor of the Churches, so speaks Hilary." With similar praise the Greek Fathers have approved of the faith and learning of Hilary; and this consent of the Greek and Latin Fathers is abundantly witnessed to by the Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon, since in it the Catholic faith was confirmed "according to the expositions of the holy Fathers Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, and Cyril."

These things being so, the fathers of the late Synod of Bordeaux have with earnest prayers besought us that to this most excellent and holy man, whose learning shone forth like a torch to scatter the darkness of errors, the title of Doctor, which he has so long enjoyed in some Churches of Gaul, may be confirmed by the authority of this Holy See, and that the same title may be extended to his honour through the universal Church, with office and Mass of double rite. But before we determined any thing on the matter, we referred it to the judgment of our venerable brothers the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, charged with the maintenance of the legitimate rites, who, at an ordinary assembly held at the Vatican on the 29th day of March in the present year, having viewed the objections brought forward by the Promoter of the Faith, and all of them having been solved by the defenders, the matter having been maturely considered, and the reasons weighed, they determined, by a unanimous suffrage, to make a rescript "for the grace of the confirmation of the title of Doctor, and the extension of the said title, with office and Mass of double rite, through the universal Church, in honour of Saint Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, if it please his Holiness."

We, therefore, willing to meet the wishes and prayers of the fathers of the recent Synod of Bordeaux, and to render due honour to the most holy Bishop, who by his writings illustrated the Catholic doctrine, of our certain knowledge and mature deliberation, and in the plenitude of apostolical authority, do ratify and confirm to Saint Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, the title of Doctor, which he enjoys in particular churches; and we will and command that the said holy Bishop be honoured for the future by the universal Church with the said title and dignity of Doctor, with office and Mass of double rite.

We decree that these present letters are and shall be firm, valid, and efficacious, and they receive and obtain their full and entire effect; and that they most fully enact that the title of Doctor be given to Saint Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, by the universal Church, and that it must be so judged and defined by all judges whomsoever, ordinary or delegated, and even the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church; and that whatsoever may be attempted contrariwise on this matter, by any authority whatsoever, knowingly or ignorantly, is void and of none effect, notwithstanding the constitutions, ordinances, or other decisions whatsoever, contrary hereunto, whether general or special, published by the apostolical see, or in universal, provincial, or synodal councils.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, under the ring of the fisherman, on the 13th day of May, in the year 1851, in the fifth year of our pontificate.

A. CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI.

DECREE OF THE HOLY CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX.

DECREED ON FRIDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 1851.

THE holy congregation of the most eminent and reverend Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, by our most holy lord Pope Pius IX., and by the holy apostolical see, set over and delegated to the index of books of erroneous doctrine, and to the proscription, expurgation, and permission of the same in the universal republic of Christendom, holden in the apostolical Vatican Palace, hath condemned and doth condemn, hath proscribed and doth proscribe, or, having been on other occasions condemned and proscribed, hath commanded and doth command to be put upon the index of prohibited books the following works:

Magnétisme, Arcanes de la Vie future dévoilés, ou l'existence, la forme, et les occupations de l'âme séparée du corps, &c. Par L. Alph. Cahagnet. [Magnetism, Secrets of the Future Life unveiled, or the existence, the form, and the occupations of the Soul separated from the Body, &c. By L. Alph. Cahagnet.]—*Decreed on the 6th day of June, 1851.*

Le Magnétiseur Spiritualiste, journal rédigé par les membres de la Société Spiritualiste de Paris. [The Spiritualist Magnetiser, a journal edited by the Members of the Spiritualist Society of Paris.]—*Decree of same date.*

Guide du Magnétiseur, ou procédés magnétiques d'après Mesmer, Puysegur, et Deleuze, &c. Par L. A. Cahagnet. [The Magnetiser's Guide, or magnetical procedures according to Mesmer, Puysegur, and Deleuze, &c. By L. A. Cahagnet.]—*Decree of same date.*

Trattato di Fisiologia considerata quale scienza di osservazione, di C. F. Burdach, Professor nella Università di Königsberg, con giunte de' Professori Baer, Meyen, Meyer, G. Muller, Rathke, Valentin, Wagner, voltata dal Tedesco in Francese de A. G. L. Jourdan. Prima traduzione Italiana, per cura di M. G. Doctor Levi Medico. [Treatise on Physiology, considered on a science of Observation, by C. F. Burdach, Professor in the University of Königsberg, with additions by Professor Baer, Meyen, &c. &c. Translated from German into French by A. G. L. Jourdan. First Italian translation, edited by M. G. Doctor Levi Medico.]—*Decree of same date.*

Supplemento alla nuova Enciclopedia popolare, ovvero Dizionario Generale di scienze, lettere, arti, storia, geographia, &c. Torino, 1850. [Supplement to the new popular Encyclopædia, or General Dictionary of science, literature, arts, history, geography, &c. &c. Turin, 1850.]—*Decree of same date.*

Dio, l'uomo, e le lettere; Pensieri d'un Esule Italiano. [God, Man, and Literature; Thoughts of an Italian Exile.]—*Decree of same date.*

L'avenir prochain de la France, entrevu dans les vrais principes de la société et la liberté, de la souveraineté soit populaire, soit nationale, et dans la révolution de 1789. Ouvrage philosophique, politique, et religieux, par l'Abbé C. F. Nicod, Curé de la Croix-Rousse. [The immediate Future of France, considered according to the true principles of society, of liberty, of sovereignty, whether popular or national, and of the revolution of 1789. A philosophical, political, and religious work, by the Abbé C. F. Nicod, Curé of Croix-Rousse.]—*Decree of same date. The author has laudably submitted himself, and has disapproved the work.*

Three pamphlets of the Canon Fr. Brenner, the titles of which are:
1. De Dogmate, et continet responsum ad quæstionem qui salvus fit?
2. Additamentum ad scriptum de Dogmate. 3. Epistola ad Professore D. Troll in eandem quæstionem de Dogmate. Landshut, 1833.

[1. Concerning Dogma, containing also a reply to the question, Who is to be saved? 2. Addition to the writing concerning Dogma. 3. Letter to Professor D. Troll on the same question concerning Dogma.]—*Decree of the Holy Office, in presence of his Holiness, on Thursday, Jan. 15, 1835.*

Therefore let no one, of whatsoever grade or condition, venture in future either to publish, or, being published, to read or keep the aforesaid condemned and proscribed works, but be bound to deliver them up to the Ordinaries, or to the Inquisitors of heretical pravity, under the penalties imposed in the Index of forbidden books.

Which having been referred by me, the undersigned Secretary of the holy Congregation, to our most holy lord Pope Pius IX., his Holiness approved of the Decree, and commanded it to be promulgated.

In testimony whereof, &c.

Given at Rome on the 9th day of June, 1851.

Loco ✠ Sigilli.	J. A., Bishop of Sabina.
Fr. A. V. MODENA, of the Order of Friars Preachers,	Card. BRIGNOLE, Prefect.
Sec. to the Holy Cong. of the Index.	

ANGLO-ITALIAN MISSION.

NEW CHURCH OF ST. PETER'S IN LONDON—APPEAL TO THE PIETY
AND CHARITY OF THE ITALIANS.

AMONG all the foreign missions, that of London presents the greatest hopes and demand. Those conversions to Catholicism, so frequent and remarkable, that necessity which in the present day Protestants feel for instruction in Catholic concerns, those efforts which the ministers of error are now making to stop the spontaneous impulse of the nation towards the truth, are strong reasons for conceiving the sweetest hopes of the immediate return of that prodigal daughter within the bosom of its afflicted mother—the Roman Church. Not only is the small number of Catholic churches in London a very formidable obstacle to the propagation of the Catholic faith in the metropolis, but even to its preservation. Let it suffice merely to remember, that of more than 200,000 Catholics who are now in that immense city, scarcely 30,000 can find a place to attend the holy Mass on the days of festival.

The Italians, there most numerous, feel in an especial manner the loss they experience from the want of a church where they might freely assemble, and without expense listen to the holy Mass; whence they are exposed to the painful alternative either of entirely neglecting all religious duties, or of frequenting Protestant churches. This danger of losing the holy faith is still more manifest to them, because some of their apostate countrymen, stimulated by Protestant gold, and trying every means to seduce them, have lately opened a Protestant temple for the Italians, which, to deceive and ensnare the simple, has been called, and bears on its façade, the lying title of "Italian Catholic Church." To remove, therefore, from the Italians the danger of perversion, and to procure for them fitting means to keep themselves steadfast in the faith, and persevering in the observance of Christian duties, the project has been approved by ecclesiastical authority of building a spacious church in the centre of London, in a fine position in one of the most majestic streets in the city, principally for the use of the Italians, and thence of other foreigners, as well as of the natives. In this way, there will be in the capital of the British empire a church Roman, not

only in its faith and principle, but also in its rites, in its ceremonies, and in the practices of sound devotion; a church similar in its material construction to the ancient Christian temples; a church which, at the express wish of the Holy Father, will be dedicated to the Prince of the Apostles, St. Peter; a church which will be always governed by a congregation of Italian secular priests founded at Rome, that the Roman spirit may always influence the same; a church in which no payment will be exacted for admission, but which will be freely open to all, and in which will be found confessors to confess in any language, and preachers to announce the divine word in the principal idioms of Europe; a church which will have annexed to it schools for both sexes, as well as a habitation for the clergy and other individuals employed in the service of the church and the schools.

As the spot fixed upon, being freehold and the permanent property of the Church, does not cost less than 6600*l.* sterling (or more than 30,000 scudi), it is proposed that, for the liquidation of this sum, as well as to provide for the expenses of the building, an experiment shall be made on the generosity of all Italy, for whose advantage the work is principally undertaken.

The holiness of our lord Pope Pius IX. has, in his prominent zeal for the good of religion and souls, by means of the holy Congregation for propagating the Faith, and that of the Bishops and religious orders, caused this great work to be most urgently recommended to the charity of Italian believers, and to the zeal of the Bishops of Italy. Moreover, the most eminent and most reverend Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, Ordinary of London, has equally recommended this most interesting work. And the most eminent and most reverend the Cardinal Vicar has published a second notification, dated March 26, 1851, in which he repeats his recommendation to the Roman charity of this same most pious object. Finally, his Holiness himself, by his rescript to the holy Congregation for propagating the Faith, dated March 9, 1851, has granted an indulgence of 100 days to whomsoever shall contribute any alms to this end.

The appeal, therefore, is made in full confidence in the piety and generosity of the Italians, who have already the merit of having first diffused the light of the true faith in England, to contribute according to their means towards a work so meritorious and honourable for Italy, and for the actual condition of London so urgent and necessary.

Alms and donations of every kind are received in Rome by the most eminent and most reverend Cardinal the Prefect of the holy Congregation for propagating the Faith; by their Excellencies the Prince and Princess Doria Pamphili; by the Rector of the Church of the Holy Saviour in the Waves at the Sistine Bridge; at London by the most eminent and reverend Cardinal Wiseman, 35 Golden Square, or by the Rev. D. Raphael Melia, apostolic missionary, 54 Lincoln's Inn Fields; and in the other kingdoms and dioceses by the representatives of the holy chair, and by the diocesan Bishops, who will have the goodness to forward the funds to Rome or to London, according to the directions above given.

At the Printing-press of the Royal Apostolic Chamber, Rome, 1851.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF FLORENCE'S APPEAL [*abridged*].

Ferdinand Minucci, by the grace of God and of the holy apostolic chair, Archbishop of Florence, of the holiness of our lord Pope Pius IX., Domestic Prelate, Assistant Bishop of the Pontifical Throne, Prince of the holy Roman Empire, and Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Merit under the title of St. Joseph:

To our most beloved clergy and people, health and benediction. If all are acquainted with the happy success of the Catholic Apostleship in the United Kingdom of Great Britain,—if the numerous restorations to the bosom of the true Roman Church, not only of the unlearned, of the simple, and of the poor, but especially of the most enlightened, of the most learned, and of the most honoured personages,—create in the faithful the sweet hope that the day is not far distant when the unity of belief will be re-established in that island which before the fatal schism was termed “the Island of the Saints.” To preserve Catholics—especially our own countrymen—from the corruption of impiety and error, it has appeared absolutely necessary to construct an Italian church in London, which, for its size and central position, should correspond to the spiritual wants of so many of the faithful who live there, as well as also to establish some schools for the scientific and religious instruction of young Italians. The reigning pontiff, highly commending the noble and holy project, in his fervent zeal and unwearied care for all that interests religion and the health of souls, has desired, by means of the holy Congregation for promoting the Faith, to recommend its execution to the charity of the faithful, granting an indulgence of one hundred days to those affording any contribution to such an object.

We, therefore, in conformity with the will of the Holy Father and of our most religious sovereign, order that, on the Sunday preceding the festivals of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, the very rev. parish priests do announce to the people that, on the said solemn occasion, a subscription shall be made towards the building of the forementioned Catholic Italian church in London; and we propose that a similar collection shall also and especially be made in the churches of the religious orders of both sexes, in those of the asylums, confraternities, or other pious institutions, in such a way as may appear most fitting to those who preside over them. The sums collected by the respective collectors shall be consigned to the treasurer of the archiepiscopal revenues charged by us to receive them, and to him may also be proffered, in the succeeding days, the private offerings of those who, inspired by a generous sentiment of Christian charity, may wish to take part in so holy a work. With reference to this, I should further announce that his Holiness Pope Pius IX., at the request of certain English Catholics, has deigned lately to grant an indulgence of 100 days to whosoever may recite three “Ave Marias,” with, after each, the invocation “Auxilium Christianorum, ora pro nobis,” and plenary indulgence for one day, at their own choice, to whosoever shall have recited them for one entire month, provided that, having confessed and communicated, he shall pray particularly for the Catholic Church of England.

We trust, beloved brethren, that you will all contribute, with such means as may be in your power (2 Cor. iv.), to the accomplishment of a work eminently Catholic, directed to the greater glory of God and of his Church, to the salvation of souls, of such merit to yourselves and of so great honour to our common country, which never was behind other nations in its exercise of the most noble Christian virtues. We impart to you, in the mean time, with all the effusion of our heart, our pastoral benediction.

From the Archiepiscopal Palace, June 9, 1851.

(Signed)

FERDINAND, Archbishop of Florence.

(Countersigned)

LUIGI SANTONI, First Archiepiscopal Chancellor.

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

SEPTEMBER 1851.

PART XLV.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

[The following article was in type *before* the recent Aggregate Catholic Meeting in Dublin.]

IT is difficult to say in which of the two popular expressions—"the rights of *civil* liberty," or "the rights of *religious* liberty"—is embodied the greatest amount of nonsense and falsehood. As these phrases are perpetually uttered, both by Protestants and by some Catholics, they contain about as much truth and good sense as would be found in a cry for the inalienable right to suicide. That Protestants and men of the world in general should besprinkle their oratory and writings with such tinsel, is hardly to be wondered at. It would be unreasonable to look for consistency from men who believe that the Bible contains some dozen or two of different revelations, from which each reader is to choose for himself his own peculiar way of salvation. What has a Protestant legislator to say for himself before an assembly in which this "right divine" is so vigorously acted upon, that every borough and county has its own "representative" creed as well as its own representative politician,—what, we say, has a Protestant to say for himself in such a Babel as this, unless he perpetually puts forth his determination to uphold "the sacred rights of liberty of conscience?" How could Lord John Russell with any decency persecute the Catholics, unless he protested that he did it in this *sacred* name? And how could he, and the rest of the wealthy men who sit on the Treasury and Opposition benches, continue to make laws for the special benefit of the rich and titled, except by solemnly asserting that it was all done for the furtherance of "the blessings of civil liberty, which are the inalienable birthright of every Briton?"

Let this pass, then, in the case of Protestants and politicians. But how can it be justified in the case of Catholics, who are the children of a Church which has ever avowed the

deepest hostility to the *principle* of "religious liberty," and which never has given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that "civil liberty," as such, is *necessarily* a blessing at all? How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular amongst us! We say "for *deceiving* the Protestant world;" though we are far enough from implying that there is not many a Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of "religious liberty," and is confident that if the tables were turned, and the Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would *in all circumstances* grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. Still, let our Catholic tolerationist be ever so sincere, he is only sincere because he does not take the trouble to look very closely into his own convictions. His great object is to silence Protestants, or to persuade them to let him alone; and as he certainly feels no personal malice against them, and laughs at their creed quite as cordially as he hates it, he persuades himself that he is telling the exact truth when he professes to be an advocate of religious liberty, and declares that no man ought to be coerced on account of his conscientious convictions. The practical result is, that now and then, but *very seldom*, Protestants are blinded, and are ready to clasp their unexpected ally in a fraternal embrace.

They are deceived, we repeat, nevertheless. Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, for an instant, when you see us pouring forth our liberalisms. When you hear a Catholic orator at some public assemblage declaring solemnly that "this is the most humiliating day in his life, when he is called upon to defend once more the glorious principle of religious freedom"—(especially if he says any thing about the Emancipation Act and the "toleration" it *conceded* to Catholics)—be not too simple in your credulity. These are brave words, but they mean nothing; no, nothing more than the promises of a parliamentary candidate to his constituents on the hustings. He is not talking Catholicism, but nonsense and Protestantism; and he will no more act on these notions in different circumstances, than *you* now act on them yourselves in your treatment of him. You ask, if he were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly, he might even hang you. But be assured of one thing: he would never tolerate you for the sake of the "glorious principles of civil and religious liberty." If he tolerated you—and most likely, as a matter of fact, he

would tolerate you—it would be solely out of regard to the interests of the Catholic Church, which he would think to be best served by letting you alone. Probably—indeed very probably—the chief hindrance to his persecution of you would be found in the remonstrances of the Pope for the time being; or perhaps the Jesuits might be your advocates, as thinking it much better to err on the side of leniency than on that of severity; or it might be that some such humble opponent of the cant of toleration as ourselves might appear on the stage and plead for mercy for you. At any rate, be assured that the Catholics who would shew you the *least* amount of tenderness would be those very “liberal” gentlemen who glory in their repudiation of “sectarianism,” who call you their “separated brethren,” and base their own demand for toleration on the principles of civil and religious liberty. You might as well fall at once into the hands of the old Spanish Inquisition, as into those of Whig “loyal” Catholics, if the chances of events should give them the power of tormenting you. In fact, the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition were the work of men who were the very counterpart of the Whig loyal Catholics of modern days.

Let us inquire, however, a little more closely into what is *meant* by this phrase respecting the blessings of civil and religious liberty, as used by Protestants and by Catholics. A very stupid person one day arguing with Dr. Johnson replied to one of the Doctor’s statements, “I don’t understand you, Dr. Johnson.” “Sir,” said the Doctor, “it is my business to find you arguments, not an understanding to comprehend them.” Thus it is a hard task to be obliged to put into intelligible language what is actually *meant* by those who advocate the principles of civil and religious liberty. Let us take civil liberty first. What is civil liberty? Is it a right possessed by every man to do just what he pleases? Does it mean universal suffrage and vote by ballot; or does it mean that, by the laws of nature, ten-pound householders alone have the right to make laws for the rest of their fellow-creatures? Does it include the rights of women, when it guarantees the rights of men? What are the rights of boys and girls, to which they are entitled by the principles of civil liberty? Do these principles give us the privilege of perjury, lying, stealing, of using foul language, of blaspheming and so forth, *ad libitum*? And *where* is civil liberty to be found? Amongst Dorsetshire labourers? In the Kilrush union? In the French courts of justice when an anti-Napoleonic editor is on trial? In Switzerland when a government mob is burning the colleges of the Jesuits? In the cotton-plantations in the United

States? It is to be found *in theory* in the "Utopia" of the Catholic Sir Thomas More, and in the "Republic" of the most Catholic-minded of non-Catholics, the philosopher Plato; but *in fact* it does not exist, and it never did exist, any where.

If by "liberty" is meant the *permission* to do certain things in certain circumstances, an intelligible explanation is affixed to the word. But then the whole notion, that there exists a certain principle of civil liberty to which all men have a kind of right, vanishes into air. "Liberty" then becomes nearly synonymous with "law," and "rights" with "duties,"—a change in expression and idea very much for the better. Every man *has* a right to be governed well; that is, it is the *duty* of every man who possesses authority over his fellow-creatures, to employ that authority to their utmost advantage. This is a Christian doctrine, intelligible enough and practicable enough; but what has this to do with universal *liberty*, or any other such hallucination? There are clearly times when an almost utter abolition of personal liberty is necessary for the happiness of every class in a nation. The sole question that ever comes into practical consideration is the *degree* to which the inhabitants of a state may be allowed each to follow their own inclinations, and enjoy an equality of privileges. Sometimes a monarchical despotism is the best practicable form of government; sometimes a wide oligarchy, like the present British constitution, in which the kingdom is governed by ten-pound householders, a small fraction of the whole population; sometimes universal suffrage and vote by ballot would ensure the best legislation and administration for the entire people; sometimes nobody under twenty-one years old ought to possess any political privilege; sometimes the franchise might begin at eighteen, or be postponed to twenty-five or thirty years of age; sometimes women ought to vote (as in England at present) in parish matters, but not in parliamentary elections; sometimes they might vote in all contests, sometimes in none. In all these arrangements no sensible man ever introduces the notion of *liberty* as an element worth a moment's thought.

It may be urged in reply, that at any rate the *profession* of a love for civil liberty does no harm; that it helps to restrain the tyranny of the powerful; that it leads to practical reforms, and familiarises men's minds with the evils of bad government. We think very much the reverse. *Cant* is always mischievous; if it does nothing else, it makes those who utter it look like either tricksters or visionaries. It takes away people's attention from definite, real grievances, and

their definite, real remedies. One single measure of redress of one single evil suffered by the poor, is worth a quarter of a century's cries in favour of their rights to full personal liberty. When an orator is eloquent on the glorious principles of liberty, he does about as much service to the oppressed, as when he trumpets the praises of the "glorious Reformation," or the "glorious Revolution" of 1688.

But if the mischief done in the name of civil liberty is not a little, far more serious are the consequences of the upholding of *religious* liberty by Catholics. For religious liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very word *liberty*, except in the sense of a permission to do certain definite acts, ought to be banished from the very domain of religion. If it means any thing more than a permission granted to individuals or to the Church to make their own choice in certain indifferent matters, or to retain their opinion on certain points not authoritatively defined, it is neither more nor less than a falsehood. No man has a right to choose his own religion. God never gave us such a permission. It is the one thing above all others that He has *not* given us. He has granted to individuals and to nations a vast latitude of choice in other matters, but neither to individuals or to nations has He conceded the faintest shadow of a choice as to his creed. What! shall a Christian dare to say that God has given us leave to treat Himself as a deceiver? That we are permitted to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God or no, as we like? That the faintest choice is given to any human being as to whether he will obey the Catholic Church or disobey it? Will even a Deist pretend that God has granted us permission to deny his own existence? None but an Atheist *can* uphold the principles of religious liberty. If there were no God, of course every man would have a right to his own fancies as to whether there were a God or no. Who should hinder him from believing that there is a God, though he were mistaken? But short of Atheism, the theory of religious liberty is the most palpable of untruths.

Shall I, therefore, fall in with this abominable delusion, and foster the notion of my fellow-countrymen, that they have a right to deny the truth of God, in the hope that I may throw dust in their eyes, and get them to tolerate my creed as one of the many forms of theological opinion prevalent in these latter days? Shall I foster that damnable doctrine, that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, and Judaism, are not every one of them mortal sins, like murder and adul-

tery? Shall I lend my countenance to this unhappy persuasion of my brother, that he is not flying in the face of Almighty God every day that he remains a Protestant? Shall I hold out hopes to him that I will not meddle with his creed, if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I lead him to think that religion is a matter for private opinion, and tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood? No! Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself, for it is truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled by its absurdity.

The *political* toleration of religious error is, indeed, quite another question. While it is impossible to maintain that every man has a right to his own religious belief, without identifying ourselves with the Atheist, we may lawfully, in certain circumstances, accord the most unlimited political and social toleration to the most audacious of heresies. It is only when Catholics become lax and worldly that they can cease to oppose heresy by argument and persuasion, or forget to labour for the conversion of unbelievers; but it is not so in the case of what is technically called "persecution." A Catholic temporal government would be guided in its treatment of Protestants and other recusants solely by the rules of expediency, adopting precisely that line of conduct which would tend best to their conversion, and to prevent the dissemination of their errors. It would do just what it does in the case of men who claimed a right to deny the rules of numbers or space. If some fanatic were publicly to teach that Euclid's Elements were all false, that twenty shillings do not make a pound; so long as his infatuation remained his own, and he continued to pay his debts, and practically recognise the common rules of pounds, shillings, and pence, so long he would be suffered to go at large. But let his anti-geometrical theories make many converts, and find their way into the brains of naval officers or railway engineers, or let him cheat his neighbours on the hypothesis that fifteen shillings are equivalent to a pound sterling, a very small space of time would elapse before our geometrical heretic found his way to Bedlam, and his own personal pounds, shillings, and pence came to be favoured with the surveillance of the Court of Chancery. Just such would be the case in the treatment of unbelievers by a Catholic state; and just such, though a thousand times more irrational, has been the treatment inflicted by *Protestant* governments on those who chose to select for

themselves a religion different from the state-patronised form of heresy.

That in an immense number of instances the persecution of heretics would be in the highest degree undesirable, there can be little doubt. And as a matter of fact, the amount of toleration at the present moment conceded by many Catholic states to their heretical subjects is far larger than that which is conceded to Catholics by anti-Catholic governments. And the less and less the Church is hampered in her action by connexion with the state, the more ample will be the toleration she affords; for it is one of the most certain truths in history, that the severest persecutions have ever been instigated by the temporal and not by the spiritual power.

Still, an adoption of the *policy* of toleration is far different from an adoption of one of the most barefaced falsehoods of Protestantism. Few things, indeed, have worked the Church more harm in England and Ireland, than the occasional borrowing of the tricks of the age into which we have sometimes permitted ourselves to be deluded. Never are we guilty of a more fatal mistake than when we seek to conciliate Protestants, by assuming their garb, by practising their devices, and by repeating their phrases, with the view of inducing them to imagine that Catholicism is more akin to Protestantism than they have hitherto supposed. To the better class of Protestants, it is nothing less than a frightful scandal to witness any thing like a fraternising with heresy in any shape. If our claims are true, they say to themselves, why do we not assume our rightful position? Why are we so anxious to make the Church wear the garb of the world? Why do we stoop, and bow, and cringe before that enemy whom we are sent to conquer and annihilate? Why are we ashamed of the deeds of our more consistent forefathers, who did only what they were bound to do by the first principles of Catholicism? Why do we put our trust in princes and peers, instead of the promises of God, who has commissioned us to place our feet upon the necks of kings? Why do we waste our energies in working the miserable machinery of conciliation towards that world which hates us, and which will hate us, and which must hate us to the end?

Little, indeed, do some amongst us know what mischief is done, and what scandal is caused, by the sight of a Protestant (perhaps a Socinian) taking part in a meeting for Catholic purposes; by the account of a Catholic dinner at which the health of the Queen is given before that of the Pope; by the employment of heretics in the actual public worship of Almighty God, so that—O melancholy spectacle!—a singer who

believes that Catholics are bowing down before a morsel of bread at the consecration of the Host, the moment the awful miracle is accomplished, takes up the words of the Church, and pretends to offer a prayer of adoration to that which he thinks, if not an idol, at least nothing more than the work of a man's hand like his own.

When, oh, when shall we see the day when we all of us know wherein our true strength lies? When shall we learn that the only possible way of conciliating Protestants is to compel them to see that we are not ashamed of our creed, that we glory in the very things at which they choose to take offence, that we ask not their friendship, that we care not for their misrepresentations, and that we fear not their utmost indignation? When shall we be convinced that this is the line of conduct which the world expects of us, which it knows that we ought to pursue, and which it knows also that we shall pursue if we have any strong faith in our own claims and powers? We are no match for the world at its own weapons. We are clumsy deceivers at the best. We dare not use the world's weapons as skilfully as the world itself uses them, because our conscience makes us scrupulous, while the world knows no scruples in its warfare with the Church. We were not commissioned to fight the world with its own arms; nor are we capable of being on good terms with the world. It must be either the foe or the servant of the Church; *i. e.* it must cease to *be* the world, and become a part of the Church herself. We have only one weapon that will do us good service, and that weapon is *faith*. God has promised us the victory over our enemies, and when we have learnt to put no trust in any power but that of God, He will lift us up, so that one man among us shall chase a thousand: but not till then.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

No. II.—*Communion of Infants and of the Sick. Other uses of the most Holy Sacrament.*

WE have already mentioned that, according to the discipline of the ancient Church, all who were baptised, infants as well as adults, were admitted to a participation in the holy Eucharist. As the passage through the Red Sea introduced the children of Israel to the wilderness, where they were fed with

the miraculous manna, so the waters of baptism introduced the Christian pilgrim to the enjoyment of that true bread which cometh down from heaven, which is provided in the holy Eucharist. As soon as they had been born again by the one sacrament into a new life, they were made partakers of the other sacrament, as the necessary food to support and prolong that life. And for this reason the holy Eucharist was very commonly reserved in the baptisteries as well as at the altar; for they seem to have communicated *immediately* after baptism; the sacrament of Confirmation sometimes intervening, sometimes following. The intimate connexion between these three sacraments, and their relation to one another, is thus explained by St. Augustin. "I have not forgotten," he says in one of his sermons preached at Easter-tide,* "the promise which I made to you who are baptized, that I would explain to you in a sermon the sacrament of the Lord's table, which you now see, and whereof you were made partakers last evening after your baptism. For it is right that you should know what it was which you then received, what it is which you are now again to receive, yea, and which you ought to receive every day of your lives. That bread, then, which you see on the altar, when it has been sanctified by the word of God, becomes the body of Christ; that chalice, or rather that which the chalice contains, when it has been sanctified in the same way by the word of God, becomes the blood of Christ. And if you have received these things worthily, you are yourselves that very thing which you have received; for the Apostle says, 'we, being many, are one bread, one body;' thus explaining to us the sacrament of the Lord's table. For consider, was that bread made of one grain, or were there not many grains of wheat? and before they became bread, they were all separate and distinct; but when they had been bruised and broken, they were brought together by water; for unless the wheat be first ground and sprinkled with water, it cannot come into that form which we call bread. In like manner, you too were first ground, as it were, by the humiliation of fasting and the sacrament of exorcism; then you received the water of baptism, whereby you were sprinkled, that you might come to this form of bread. But bread is not made without fire. What, then, is signified by fire? This fire is chrism; the oil of our fire is the sacrament of the Holy Spirit. This, therefore, is added, like fire after the water; and thus you are made into this bread, that is, the body of Christ. We, being many, are one bread, one body; all that partake of one bread, that is, of the bread of the holy Eucharist."

* Serm. 227, alias de Div. Serm. 83.

The practice of giving communion to little infants appears to have been at first quite universal in the Church; and it was administered to them either from the chalice only, or more rarely, as also sometimes to the very sick,* by means of a small fragment of the Host, moistened either in common water or unconsecrated wine, or even in the sacred blood itself. Among the Greeks and Maronites, the method of communicating infants was always by dipping a spoon into the sacred blood, and putting it into the mouth, that it might be sucked; and this custom is still continued. But in the Latin Church the holy Eucharist is no longer given in any way to children, who are without the use of reason, and therefore unable to discern the Lord's body; not that she thereby condemns, as the Council of Trent expressly declares, the contrary practice of antiquity. Far otherwise, for the Greeks and Maronites,† who have retained it, are still in her communion; but forasmuch as it never was accounted essential to salvation, though the schismatical Greeks would fain represent it to have been otherwise, she has been moved by weighty and probable reasons to change this portion of her discipline, exercising therein that discretionary power which belongs to her, for the glory of God and the wellbeing of his faithful people. It is impossible to fix the precise time when this change was made, as it was not so much the effect of any positive decree as that the ancient custom fell into gradual disuse. It would appear, however, that the practice was finally abandoned about the same time with the withdrawal of the chalice from all communicants, which may not improbably have in some measure contributed to it. Certainly the communion of infants still continued till the end of the eleventh century; but even then it was only partial, and had in some places degenerated into an unmeaning custom of giving them after baptism common wine that had not been consecrated. This senseless shadow of the ancient practice was of course severely condemned by the bishops and theologians of the day; yet something of the kind seems to have lingered on for a considerable period, for we find a Bishop of Paris at the end of the twelfth century obliged to prohibit priests from giving hosts to little children under any pretext, *even hosts that had not been consecrated.*‡

It is worth observing, that it was one of the complaints against the Bohemians§ (who were so clamorous for the use of the chalice), that they persisted in communicating infants and

* Conc. Bayeux. c. 77, apud Labbe. Conc. xiv. p. 1331.

† Van Espen. Jus Eccl. Univ. pars ii. tit. iv. c. 2.

‡ See Mabillon, Præf. in Sæc. iii. Bened.

§ Æneas Sylvius, Ep. 130, c. Boem.

persons of deranged intellect, in spite of the contrary practice of the Western Church and the positive prohibition of the Council of Basle. English Protestants, with that inconsistency by which their whole system is so pre-eminently characterised, imitate the Bohemians in one particular and dissent from them in another; the practice of the ancient Church being much more uniform in favour of that peculiarity which they have rejected, than it is in favour of that which they have retained.

But now, to pass at once from one extremity of life to the other, from the swaddling-clothes of the cradle to those of the grave, let us see what has been the discipline of the Church with reference to administering the holy Eucharist at the hour of death. We have seen her solicitude to provide her children with this heavenly armour as soon as they enter upon that spiritual conflict in which it is so needful; let us next observe how careful she has ever been that they should not be deprived of it in the hour of their latest and severest struggle. Our blessed Lord always specially connected this holy sacrament with the promise of the gift of life and deliverance from death. "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "I am the bread of life, that if any man eat of it he may not die." It is the earnest desire, then, of the Church, that none should ever walk in the midst of the shadow of death until they have first been strengthened by a participation of that table which God has prepared before them. "Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they have comforted me. Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that afflict me." At one time, indeed, only the sacrament of Penance, and not that of holy Communion, was conceded to those who had apostatised from the faith, and then were anxious to be received again into the household of God before they died; and this measure of severity was considered necessary in order that men might have the fear of so terrible a judgment hanging over their heads, to deter them from giving way under the far less dreadful sufferings of temporal persecution. It was thought that men might too easily yield and fall away before the fear of death, if they could look forward to the certain prospect of an entire restoration to the fulness of their privileges, the moment that fear was withdrawn and they expressed sorrow and contrition for their fault.

But this severe discipline was not of long duration. It was ordered in the general Council of Nice that, with the consent of the Bishop, communion might be given to all death-bed penitents who should desire it, provided only that in case of their recovery, they should be restored, not to the number of

the faithful communicants, but only to that grade of penitents to which they before belonged, or at most to those who were permitted to take part in the prayers, but not in the holy Sacrifice: and this may be taken as a true statement of the general practice of the Church in this matter, more particularly when in later times it became necessary to protest against the unchristian severity of the Novatian heretics. And at a later period still, when amid the greater multitudes of Christians, many were found not only weak and unstable, so as in time of persecution to fall away, but even such as voluntarily to give themselves up to the practice of those things which ought not to be named among Christians,—thefts, murders, adulteries, and other crimes which the laws were wont to punish with death,—the Church still did not refuse even to these, if they shewed signs of humble and sincere repentance, the consolation of this life-giving sacrament. In the middle ages, however, not the Church, but the State, and on political, not on religious grounds, denied this merciful indulgence both in France and in Spain,* and probably in other places also: it was argued that a person who was cut off for his crimes from the society of the state to which he had belonged was surely unworthy to be a member of that higher and more holy fellowship of the Christian Church; moreover, that as he had not yet made public satisfaction for his crimes, he ought not to be treated as though he were on a par with honest unoffending citizens. We need hardly say that these sophistical arguments, confounding civil with religious privileges, were the arguments of statesmen, not of theologians. Clement V. at the Council of Vienne most vehemently denounced and condemned the unchristian and damnable abuse of refusing the holy Eucharist to these unhappy persons; still it was not until the year 1396 that even liberty of sacramental confession was conceded to them by Charles VI., and at the end of the next century the blessed sacrament of the holy Eucharist was still withheld. Louis XI. of France refused it to the Duke of Luxembourg in the year 1475, and would only permit that he should receive some of the *eulogiæ*, or blest bread, before he died. Forty years afterwards, however, the more merciful rule of the Church was allowed to prevail, with this addition, eminently characteristic of her habitual keen and jealous watchfulness in every thing that concerns the blessed Sacrament, viz. that the extreme penalty of the law should be postponed until the day after that on which the culprit had received the Viaticum, “that so they might not violate the temple of God, which is holy.”

* Van Espen, ubi supra. See also Bellotte de Rit. Eccl. Laudun. pars i. c. 2, ed. Paris, 1662.

But let us not dwell on these saddening recollections ; let us rather turn to the more joyful contemplation of Christians who had not so disgraced their profession, and were now approaching the hour of their deliverance out of this troubled world, to go and receive the reward of their labours : these the Church never failed to arm with this heavenly sacrament before they entered upon that last scene of their earthly pilgrimage, which was to seal and confirm the issue of all the rest : they were about to engage in their last struggle with the powers of evil, who would then rage most furiously, knowing that their time was short ; and how should they stand in the day of battle, except the Lord were with them ? Moreover, as St. Chrysostom says, “ if the destroying angel passed over the houses of the Israelites when he saw the blood of the paschal lamb sprinkled upon the door-posts, how much more shall not devils fly from him whom they see to have been fed by the very body and blood of the true Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world ? yea, and shall not angels come to carry such an one into Abraham’s bosom, since where the body is, there shall the eagles be gathered together ? ” St. Jerome* says that “ he runs great risk who hastens to arrive at the heavenly mansions without this strengthening manna.” “ A man once told me,” says St. Chrysostom, “ and one too who had not heard it from another, but had himself been deemed worthy to see and hear what he told, that when men are about to depart from this life, if they have participated in the holy mysteries with a pure conscience, angels come and surround them at the moment of their death, like so many guards, and carry them hence, because of that which they have received.”

We are not surprised, therefore, to read in ecclesiastical history of many supernatural interventions of God’s providence, in order that his servants might not be deprived of so powerful an assistance in the hour of their greatest need ; thus it is related of the holy doctor whose words we have just quoted, that St. John and St. Paul† appeared in a vision and gave him the holy Communion before he breathed his last. We have mentioned already how St. Honoratus was warned in a dream by night to go and visit St. Ambrose, whom he found dying, and anxious to receive the body of his Lord ; and Venerable Bede gives us another instance from a monastery in our own country, in which a lad who was lying sick of some grievous epidemic in the year 681, received an admonition from heaven, by the lips of St. Peter and Paul, that he should ask for the Viaticum of the body and blood of his Lord, for that on that very day he would be removed to hea-

* Comm. in S. Matt. lib. ii. c. 15.

† Niceph. Hist. Eccles. xiii. 37.

ven.* It seems also to have been revealed to the penitent Serapion, whose history has been already mentioned from the letter of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, that his life was only prolonged until he should have communicated; for the first words which he uttered after his three days of speechless lethargy were to chide his grandson for *detaining* him so long, and to desire him to fetch the priest with the blessed Sacrament, which as soon as he had received, he died. It was for this reason that the blessed Sacrament was reserved not only in churches, but also in the private houses of the priests and in the infirmaries of religious communities,† that so it might never be wanting when any chanced to need it; and in order that there might be no risk of disappointment through the absence or illness of the priest, it was, as we have seen, for a long time permitted to the inferior clergy, and even to the laity, to carry and to administer it on such occasions. It sometimes happened, however, that the dying man was wholly unable to receive it, or that it was not probable that, if he received it, he would be able to retain it. In the former case it was at one time by no means uncommon to bring the blessed Sacrament at least into his chamber, that he might adore, or even kiss it, and so be strengthened and consoled by its immediate presence, though he could not receive it into himself; while in the latter we read occasionally of priests who, shrinking from exposing the blessed Sacrament to any irreverence, yet unwilling too to distress the suffering petitioner by an open refusal of his request, sometimes offered him an unconsecrated Host, as though it had really been that which he desired, the holy Eucharist. Neither of these practices was such as the Church could sanction; the former, though not in any way blameworthy, was yet judged to have a dangerous tendency in leading some perhaps to rest contented with this use of the blessed Sacrament, instead of making it really their own at that critical moment of their lives; and therefore it was expressly forbidden by St. Pius V., and forty years later by Paul IV. also; St. Charles Borromeo too prohibited it: the blessed Sacrament was never to be taken to the sick, excepting with the intention of giving him communion; but if, when the priest arrived, this was impossible, then after having used certain prayers, it was permitted to give benediction with it in the pyx, or if the sick man very earnestly desired it, the pyx might be opened so as to expose the blessed Sacrament to his view.‡ The other practice (that of substituting an unconsecrated for a consecrated Host in cases

* Hist. Eccles. iv. 14.

Bede, H. E. iv. 24. See also Greg. M. Hom. xl. in Evang.

† Act. Med. Eccles. tom. i. p. 180.

where there was difficulty of swallowing, or reason to apprehend sickness) was never the subject of any distinct prohibition, that not being considered necessary, since it had never at any time been more than the practice of a few indiscreet individuals, acting upon their own judgments; and moreover it had been very commonly detected at the time by a supernatural revelation, so that its object was not attained. In particular, a story is told of Hugo of St. Victor, who died about A.D. 1100, and in whose case this had been attempted, that he sharply rebuked those who were practising the deceit, and bid them go and bring him the very body of Christ, for that the Lord himself would provide against all scandal. They obeyed; and when they returned, he prayed, "O God, may the Son ascend to the Father, and the servant to the Lord who made him;" upon which the Host immediately disappeared, and he himself died.

Another use, or rather abuse, of this holy sacrament was both more common, and, if we may judge from the number of councils in which it was prohibited, was not so easily suppressed; we mean, the practice of burying some portion of it with the dead. That this had crept into the Church at a very early period is clear, from the fact that it is expressly forbidden in a canon of the Third Council of Carthage, which was held before the close of the fourth century; the words of the canon are too distinct to be misunderstood: "we will that the Eucharist shall not be given to the corpses of the dead; for it was said by the Lord, Take, eat; but corpses can neither take nor eat." The same canon was repeated in another Council, held in the end of the sixth century, which at the same time prohibited the giving the kiss of peace to the dead; and again at the end of the seventh century.* Nevertheless, it appears that a portion of the blessed Sacrament was buried with St. Basil, and this too by his own desire; for he had some time before divided a Host which he had consecrated into three parts; and having consumed one, directed that another should be reserved to be given to him at the time of his death; and that the third should be buried with his corpse. Again, we read in the Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great,† that the body of one of the monks of St. Benedict, who died on a day when he had gone out from the monastery without the abbot's blessing, would not rest in its grave, but was found again and again lying on the surface of the ground disinterred, until St. Benedict desired them to lay a portion of the holy Eucharist upon the body, and so to commit it once more to the earth. Indeed, it is said that St. Benedict directed

* See Labbe, Conc. tom. vi. p. 644; tom. vii. p. 1374.

† Dialog. ii. 24.

that all his monks should be buried in this way; and that it was the ordinary mode of burial also among the Greek priests. The latest instance of the practice, if, indeed, it be an instance at all, is to be found in the burial of our own St. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindesfarne, in the end of the seventh century; of whom Venerable Bede testifies that his body was transported to this island, robed in full pontifical robes, with shoes on his feet, ready to go forth and meet his Lord, and with the Host resting on his breast. The word used is *oblata*, the oblations, or offleytes as they were called; and Mabillon* and some others are strongly of opinion that in this instance at least it was an unconsecrated Host, and that it was used for the same reason as the vestments, chalices, and patens, viz. as so many insignia of his office, being the instruments about which he had been engaged during life; and this interpretation is confirmed by the case of St. Otman in the ninth century, with whose body *many* Hosts were buried, doubtless with this signification. Mabillon also desires to shew that, in the instance of the monk which we have mentioned, the blessed Sacrament was only to be laid on the body, as if in token of forgiveness, and then removed, before the body was again committed to the dust; but this seems quite incompatible with the language of St. Gregory; and since it is impossible to deny that the practice we are considering ever really existed, because the language of the decrees of Councils so distinctly prohibits it, these may well be considered to be genuine instances of it, however unwilling we naturally are to connect great and venerable names with the sanction of an erroneous practice.

Then, besides these ordinary uses of the blessed Sacrament, as the spiritual food of infants, of the living, of the dying, and even of the dead, there are a few occasional uses in which It was employed during the middle ages, which deserve mention. The most prominent of these was what may be called its juridical use. At a time when it was so common to leave all doubtful and difficult disputes between man and man to the immediate decision of God, this was one among many methods by which it was done. If a theft or any other secret crime had been committed in a religious house, it was ordered that Mass should be said by the abbot (or superior, whoever he might be), and that all the members should communicate, the priest, as he administered the Host, using these words: "May the body of the Lord prove thee this day." If a priest or bishop were himself the accused party, he was to clear himself of the charge by offering the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. This was done even by the Supreme Pontiff, Gre-

* Act. SS. Bened. Præf. in Sæc. 3, pars i. § 53.

gory VII., in the year 1077, in the presence of the Emperor Henry; although, as a general custom, it had been prohibited and abandoned some time before this. When the holy Pope was about to communicate, he turned to the place where the emperor was kneeling, and said with great solemnity: "I know that I stand suspected in the opinions of some of simony, and of other very grievous crimes: now in order that I may utterly remove every scruple of scandal from every mind by one compendious satisfaction, behold here the body of the Lord, which I am about to receive: may it be made to me to-day for a trial of my innocence, that the Almighty God may, by his own judgment, either absolve me of all suspicion of the crime laid to my charge, if I be really innocent; or, if I be guilty, may strike me with sudden death." He then proposed to the emperor that he too should clear himself in the same manner of the crimes of which he was accused, by taking a portion of the same Host as the Pope himself was to receive; but this the emperor declined. In this instance the deed was voluntary and unexpected, and the form of words was of Gregory's own choice at the moment; where it was required by law, it was usual for those who were to be tried by this ordeal to hear Mass, and to observe abstinence during the three preceding days,* and then on the appointed day to receive the holy Communion, and to swear to their innocence, the priest having first addressed them in the following words:† "I adjure thee, N., by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by the Christianity which you took upon you in baptism, by the holy Trinity, by the holy Gospels, by the holy relics which are in this church and in all the world, and by that holy baptism, whereby the priest regenerated thee, that thou in nowise presumest to take this most sacred body of the Lord, nor dare to approach this holy altar, if thou hast committed this fault, or consented to it, or if thou knowest who did."

In Brittany,‡ Guienne, and some other places, it was sanctioned, if not required, by the French parliaments, that before trying any causes the judges should go to church, and there, the blessed Sacrament in the ciborium being placed upon the altar, all those who were going to plead before them were made to take the accustomed oaths, holding the foot of the ciborium, or at least coming quite close to it and in its immediate presence.

This use of the blessed Sacrament, as a means of increas-

* Martene de Antiq. Eccl. Rit. lib. iii. c. vii.

† Ex leg. Eccl. Æthelstani Reg. Angl.

‡ Traité de l'Exposition du St. Sacrement, par M. J. B. Thiers, liv. v. c. ii. ed. Paris, 1679.

ing the natural solemnity of an oath or an exhortation, was often had recourse to both by Catholics and by heretics on any extraordinary occasions. The arch-heretic Novatus,* when he gave the holy Communion to his deluded followers, did not administer it with the usual form of words, merely saying "The body of Christ," and receiving from them a short and emphatic *Amen* in reply, which was then the practice of the Catholic Church; but he took this opportunity of making them swear by the body and blood of their Lord, that they would never desert his faction, nor return to the communion of Cornelius the Roman Pontiff.

When William, the young and powerful Duke of Aquitaine, who had espoused the side of the Antipope against Pope Innocent II., and was besides guilty of frequent irregularities of life, was present on one occasion where St. Bernard was saying Mass, the Saint came down from the altar to the place where he was, holding the blessed Sacrament over the paten, and addressed him with these words: "We have long used entreaties with you, and you have despised us; other servants of God have joined their prayers to ours, but you have heeded them not: behold now the Son of the Virgin, the Head and Lord of the Church, whom thou persecutest, is come to approach thee; behold the Judge, at whose name every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, in earth, and in hell; behold the just Avenger of all crimes, into whose hands the spirit, whereby thou art now animated, must one day fall,—will you dare to despise *him* also? Will you dare to make as little account of the Master as you have of the servants?"† The history of the duke's after-life is the best evidence we can have of the effects which this startling appeal produced upon his mind and heart. Here, too, is perhaps the proper place to mention that action of the blessed Peter Fourer, recorded by Benedict XIV. in one of his Bulls;‡ namely, that he once carried the blessed Sacrament into a tavern, where he knew that men were assembled blaspheming the name of God; and there, exposing it before them, he preached such stirring words of rebuke and exhortation, as brought them immediately to repentance; but the learned Pontiff immediately adds, that actions such as these are not to be proposed for general imitation; neither, on the other hand, are they to be blamed in themselves, since it is manifest, both from the event and from the extraordinary virtues of those who did them, that they proceeded from a divine inspiration.

* Euseb. H. E. vi. 43.

† Ratisbonne, Histoire de St. Bernard, c. xix.

‡ Bullarium, tom. ix. p. 58.

One of the sacred species in this most holy Sacrament was also sometimes put to another use, which must not be omitted in this list of occasional and extraordinary practices connected with our subject, though it is one whose strangeness by no means commends itself either to our feelings or our reason: we allude to what is told of Pope Theodore I., in the middle of the seventh century, that when he deposed Pyrrhus, the Patriarch of Constantinople,* on account of his Monothelite heresy, both he and all others who signed the deposition, did so with ink into which some drops had been poured from the sacred chalice. The same thing was done also at the Eighth Council of Constantinople, at the deposition of Photius, who had been unjustly and uncanonically intruded into the see of St. Ignatius; and doubtless was done with the intention of adding new solemnity to an already solemn act, and of giving to it the character of a confirmed and irrevocable decree. We read of it again on another and a purely political occasion, where the peace, too, which it professed to ratify was in reality false and pretended; that made between Charles the Bald and Bernard Count of Toulouse, A.D. 854.†

The practice of the early ages of the Church, in sending the blessed Sacrament from one bishop to another, even in countries very distant from one another,‡ as a token of friendship and intercommunion, is much more intelligible, and strikes us at once as natural and appropriate, because it is so pre-eminently a sacrament of love and union; but since there was danger of accident during these long journeys, it soon became more usual to send the *eulogiæ*, or blest bread, instead of the consecrated host. Thus St. Paulinus§ sent the *eulogiæ* to St. Augustin; but Pope Honorius sent the blessed Sacrament itself to St. Berin, Bishop of Dorchester in this country, in the seventh century. It is doubtful whether it was the *eulogiæ* or the body of Christ which was sent to the parochial clergy of Rome, in the fourth century, every week, from the sovereign Pontiff, by the hands of acolytes; the more general opinion is, that it was really the blessed Sacrament itself; but the contrary opinion is supported by the authority of Baronius;|| it is certain that those to whom it was not sent were not permitted to say Mass during the following week; but the rule did not apply to the clergy of the neighbouring villages, or even of the cemeteries outside the walls. Indeed it referred only to the twenty-five titular churches, as it were dioceses, appointed by Marcellus for the administration of baptism and penance to the numerous converts from paganism.

* Bronius, Annales, tom. viii. 388; Rome, 1599. † Thiers, ubi supra, v. c. 12.

‡ Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

§ Ep. xlv. ad Aug.

|| Tom. iii. 103.

It was also very common for bishops and priests to carry the holy Eucharist about with them in a burse hung round their necks, whenever they travelled, whether by land or by sea; and it is said that St. Thomas of Canterbury carried it about with him in this way during the wanderings to which he was subjected by the violent persecution of Henry. This practice was continued by Greek monks,* and by the Maronites, even during the last century, when it was prohibited by Benedict XIV. It was also carried in processions, as at the coronation of the Pope or of the emperor; also before the Pope, and indeed before all Bishops, when they were going to sing Mass. This was continued down to the ninth century, since which time it has been the practice both of the Supreme Pontiff, and of the rest, always to go to the altar of the blessed Sacrament, and there adore It before vesting for High Mass. It was carried before the Archbishop of Benevento during his visitations of his diocese,† down to the time of Paul II. A.D. 1164; also by some of the earlier kings of France, when they were journeying within their own dominions; but especially It always accompanied the Popes when they travelled any distance from their own homes, generally preceding them by a short day's journey. We read of this having been done by the Antipope Benedict XIII. when he went to visit his friends in Spain in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and by Pius II. about fifty years later; by Clement VII. also, when he sailed from Leghorn to Marseilles, in the year 1533, to celebrate the marriage of his relative, Catherine de Medici, with Henry, second son of the French king; and a very detailed account of this practice at a still later period has been given us by Angelo Roccha, who was master of the ceremonies to Pope Clement VIII., and was one of those who accompanied the blessed Sacrament before the Pontiff when he was proceeding to Ferrara to reclaim that dukedom to the Church, in the year 1598. The Pope himself consecrated a host for that purpose the day before in St. Peter's, and a solemn procession of the religious orders and clergy, in which the Pope and Cardinals took a part, accompanied It, and remained on their knees until the vessel in which It was placed was fastened on a white steed, richly caparisoned in red silk, with a bell of silver-gilt hung round his neck, and the steed itself was no longer in sight. The order of procession was this: two chaplains preceded on horseback, bearing silver lanterns, and the sacristan followed on a white mule, with a white wand, and dressed in a mantelletta and mozzetta. A number

* Arcudius de Concord. utr. Eccl. iii. 59.

† Ang. Roccha de SS. &c. Op. tom. i. p. 38.

of other ecclesiastics joined the company, and they repeated the seven penitential psalms, the litanies, the rosary, and other devotions, as they went. Hundreds and thousands of people flocked from the neighbouring villages to adore the blessed Sacrament as It passed, and raised triumphal arches at different points of the road. When they drew near to any town, they were met about a mile outside the walls by a number of military, ecclesiastics, and various confraternities; and at the gates the principal magistrates were always ready, bearing the baldacchino, under which the blessed Sacrament was to pass through the streets, which were strewn with flowers, and the walls hung with tapestry, until they arrived at the cathedral, or the principal church of the place, where It was deposited on the high altar, and watched and adored by different ecclesiastics during the night. But if the Pope desired to enter any town with peculiar pomp, the company which attended the blessed Sacrament awaited his arrival in some church immediately without the walls.

We need scarcely remind our readers that the holy Pontiff Pope Pius VI. (that *peregrinus Apostolicus*, as St. Malachi's prophecy most truly designated him) always travelled, during his long and painful journeyings, with the most holy Eucharist suspended in a small pyx on his own breast, or borne in a similar position by one of his domestic prelates travelling in the same carriage with himself; and that Pope Pius IX. too, in his flight from Rome to Gaeta, armed himself with the same source of divine consolation and strength during that perilous journey.

In the middle ages, it was not unusual to use this august Sacrament as a means of checking or averting evils which seemed to threaten serious mischief of any kind; more especially it was used against fire and tempests. The earliest instance which we have of this belongs to the end of the eleventh century, when the monastery of Castro having been set on fire by lightning, the flames were at length repressed by Gerald the abbot holding up the body of Christ in the direction where they were most raging. The same thing is said to have been done, and done successfully, in the case of a fire which broke out at Auxerre on July 31, 1638; and again at Hale in the Tyrol, in the year 1647; and a French theologian,* writing towards the end of the seventeenth century, complains very bitterly of the preaching of a certain Capuchin at Toulouse, about fifty years before, which, he says, had caused the practice to become much more common. In the middle of the last century, on occasion of a fire in the Piazza Monta-

* Thiers, liv. iii. c. xxi.

nara, in the parish of San Niccolo in Carcere in Rome, the question was minutely examined by the supreme authority, and decided. The circumstances of the case were these:* as soon as the fire, which had broken out originally among some very small and insignificant houses, threatened to spread and devastate the whole neighbourhood, the canons of the church (for it was a collegiate as well as a parochial church) caused the bells to be sounded, that all the people might come together to deprecate God's wrath, and pray for the removal of the scourge. They were soon assembled in great numbers, and recited the rosary, the litany, &c. at the altar of the Blessed Virgin, after which one of the clergy provoked them to tears of repentance by a very eloquent and impassioned discourse; and now the people earnestly besought that he would give them benediction with the most blessed Sacrament, and also that he would bless in the same manner the place where the devouring element was so furious, the progress of which might then perhaps be stayed. Unwilling to disappoint their devotion, he acceded to the request, but not without giving great scandal to some who witnessed what was done; so much so, that the whole matter was brought before the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV., whose decision is given in a brief addressed to the Cardinal Vicar. This brief is marked by the usual careful and diligent research which characterises all the decrees of that Pope, and the substance of his decision was briefly this: that whereas such a use of the blessed Sacrament had never been authoritatively sanctioned in any part of the Church, but had only been the result of individual zeal and inspiration in particular instances; it had, on the other hand, been expressly prohibited under pain of suspension at a synod of the Archbishop of Paris, in the year 1674, and also by the Cardinal di Rohan, in the ritual of the church of Argentina, and apparently for weighty and sufficient reasons; viz. that God has nowhere promised to his people an exemption from this world's ills; that the daily experience which we have of his providence teaches us that He often permits such temporal evils to happen to all; since therefore it may be his will that this fire should increase and do mischief, it was not right that we should, as it were, tempt Him and try his power, by using any but the natural and ordinary means of checking it; for that, if we had recourse to supernatural means, as though we expected a miracle, and those means should fail, we had put a stumbling-block in the way of weaker brethren, and given occasion to the enemy to blaspheme. Without censuring then the devotion which had prompted the use of the blessed Sacra-

* Ben. XIV. Bull. tom. ix. p. 54.

ment in the present instance, it was not to be allowed for the future; only the door of the tabernacle might be opened on such occasions, that the people might be more earnest in their prayers, offered up, as they then would be, in the more immediate presence of God. And this is just what St. Charles Borromeo had ordered in his third provincial council, held about two hundred years before. It was not unnecessary to check the indiscreet zeal of some persons in this matter, since it appears that some had even dared to throw the blessed Sacrament itself into the flames for the purpose of checking them; an abuse which would have seemed absolutely incredible, had it not been set beyond all doubt by a decree of St. Francis of Sales, prohibiting it under pain of excommunication.

In France and Germany,* in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and for many ages before, it was common, during tempests and hurricanes of unusual violence, to call the people together to the church, and there in the same way, having taken the sacred pyx out of the tabernacle, to go to the doors and make with it three times the sign of the cross, saying, "Christ conquers, Christ reigns; Christ commands you, O clouds and tempests, that you be dissolved;" not from any idle dream that inanimate things could be adjured to do any thing of themselves, but because they are sometimes employed by evil spirits, who are expressly called "princes of the power of the air," to work harm to the children of men; and these of course may be exorcised, and their power be broken, by the presence of the blessed Sacrament.

An instance of this practice is recorded in the life of St. Thomas of Villanova,† in which even a layman ventured to use the blessed Sacrament for this purpose, in the absence of the clergy. A sudden and terrible tempest of thunder and lightning threatened the village of Mislara in the diocese of Valentia; and some of the inhabitants ran to entreat the curate to present himself at the door of the church with the Cross or the blessed Sacrament, in order that it might please God to avert the threatened danger. The priest not being there, a good old man amongst them clothed himself in a cassock, and covering his hands with a napkin, he proceeded to take the ciborium in which was the blessed Sacrament, and to carry it to the lower end of the church, followed by other peasants, with wax-candles in their hands, to implore the Divine mercy with faith and devotion. When arrived at the church-door, he made the sign of the cross, and gave benediction with the most holy Sacrament; and lo! the storm dispersed without touching their territory. Of course, this act

* Thiers, v. c. xi.

† English Translation, p. 155.

was rash, and contrary to the discipline of the Church, as having been done by a layman; but it shews what was an ordinary practice of the clergy upon such occasions, and that the simple-hearted faith of the people was acceptable in God's sight. The practice, however, was altogether condemned and forbidden even to the clergy themselves about fifty years later, A.D. 1573.

We read also* that in some parts of Germany it was once the custom for the parish priest, somewhere about Whitsuntide, to ride round the fields of his parish, accompanied by many others on horseback, chanting and bearing in a burse round his neck the blessed Sacrament, that it might give an abundant blessing to all the fruits of the coming harvest; and in the same way, during the procession of Corpus Christi, in the Christian *Reductions* (as they were called) of Paraguay, the natives used to place all their maize and other grain at the doors of their houses, that it might obtain a blessing from the holy Eucharist as it passed; an act of faith which who shall presume to censure, since God vouchsafed so signal a reward to those who, in the days of the Apostles, "brought forth their sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that when Peter came, his shadow at the least might overshadow some of them?"

We find occasional instances of the blessed Sacrament having been carried even into the field of battle, that the soldiers might be animated to fight with greater courage in its immediate presence. In the history of our own country† we read of a battle which almost received its name from this circumstance; the Battle of the Standard, as it was called, fought on the 22d of August, A.D. 1138, within two or three miles of North Allerton, between King Stephen and David king of the Scots, or at least between the English and the Scots, for Stephen was not there. The English erected on the field a lofty pole, like the mast of a ship, fastened into a kind of carriage. To this mast they attached the standards of St. Peter, of St. John of Beverley, and of St. Wilfred, the patron saints of York, Beverley, and Ripon; and in the centre of the cross, which surmounted the whole, was the blessed Sacrament enclosed in a silver pyx,‡ to be their leader and their standard-bearer.

Again, in the year 1230, a priest carried the blessed Sacrament into the field of battle to encourage the Christians, who were fighting against the Moors in the kingdom of Valencia;

* *Omn. gent. mores*, Joann. Boem. iii. 15, p. 221, ed. Venice, 1542.

† *Hist. Anglic Script.* pp. 262, 321; ed. London, 1652.

‡ Christianus Lupus speaks as though it had been in an *ostensorium*, and itself visible to the soldiers; but our own historians clearly imply the contrary; and an *ostensorium* was not then known.

and once more, A.D. 1444, it was carried before the Hungarians, when they were fighting against the Turks; and this too was sanctioned, in like manner, by the presence of high ecclesiastical authorities, the Cardinal Julian being in the company of the king of Hungary.

It is to be observed, however, that all these battles were, in a certain sense, battles undertaken for the defence of religion; the two last, against the Turks and Moors, were manifestly such; and even the Battle of the Standard was not so much the result of a desire to defend the rights of Stephen against those of Maude, as it was an act of determined resistance, on the part of the inhabitants of the northern counties, against men who profaned their churches, burnt their monasteries, and put their wives and children to the sword. Indeed, the English troops had been brought together only by the invitation of Thurstan the Archbishop of York, and were accompanied for the most part by the parish clergy to the appointed place of meeting. There three days were spent in fasting and devotion, and on the fourth they were sent out with the Archbishop's blessing; and even on the field of battle itself the Bishop of Orkney, one of Thurstan's suffragans, pronounced the words of absolution over the whole army before the engagement began; and the Archdeacon, as well as a great number of other clergy, were present, having been occupied for a considerable time in hearing the confessions of the soldiers, and in the performance of their other spiritual duties. We may look upon all these battles, then, as in some sort partaking of the character of a crusade, in which case the presence of the blessed Sacrament strikes us with altogether different feelings from those which we should experience had the same thing been done in battles undertaken from mere worldly motives, such as thirst after revenge, the desire of conquest, political aggrandisement, and the like. In the same way, on other occasions also, when in times past the blessed Sacrament has been used in Catholic countries to add the solemnity of a religious sanction to what appears to be a purely secular or political act, there has always been a true spiritual meaning and a good and praiseworthy purpose involved in the action; as, for instance, when Henry III. in 1588, and Louis XIII. in 1614, accompanied a very magnificent procession of the blessed Sacrament in Paris, before opening their respective parliaments, they did so, as they expressly declared, in order to shew "that they put their only hope of deliverance out of all their troubles and distresses in the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, the Mediator between God and man."*

* Thiers, liv. iii. c. ii.

The task would be quite endless to enumerate *every* use that has ever been made of this most august Sacrament by the devotion of private individuals obeying the natural instinct of their own faith and love, nor do we propose to ourselves to undertake it; but we believe we have now mentioned all the *principal* uses, or at least as many as have once received a certain degree of sanction from the Church, either generally or in any particular age or country, or in the persons of some of her most distinguished saints or rulers, and have afterwards been rejected and condemned, or allowed to fall into desuetude, and so may not now be repeated. A few others will come before us perhaps when we speak of the miracles, either of mercy or of judgment, by which the divine nature of this Sacrament has been so frequently and so signally vindicated; and there are others, again, which are public and general, but which began in later years, and still continue, such as Benediction, the Quarant' Ore, &c. Of these also we will speak, each in its proper place; but first we desire to complete our sketch of all that concerns our subject during the earlier ages of the Church.

Passion, Love, and Rest;

OR,

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY.

(Continued from p. 41.)

CHAPTER XI.—*The two Bridals.*

TERRIFIED at Miss Englefield's cry, I rang the bell violently, thinking that there was something far more serious than a mere fainting fit. Then I rushed to her side, and seeing her look very like a dead person, I dashed out of the room, and called loudly for help. Edith and Helen were with her in a few moments; and before they had time to torment her with all the remedies usual on such occasions, the poor old lady opened her eyes, and very rapidly recovered.

"Is he gone?" she murmured, as soon as her senses were a little restored.

Edith and Helen looked at me for an explanation, as I replied that he must be half a mile distant by this time.

"So goes one of my longest-cherished hopes," sighed Miss Englefield, with a look of intense distress. "My poor, poor

Helen," she continued, "my heart bleeds for you; but it is better that it should have come out before you were married than after."

Helen rung her hands in silent suffering, but said nothing. I soon found that I should be an unwelcome guest, if I prolonged my visit in their present state of mind, and therefore took my leave.

The next morning I was there again, wondering what would be the results of the previous day's events, and full of wild speculations as to the manner in which Helen, as a Catholic educated in the faith from her infancy, would bear her affliction. I was astonished to find her sitting calmly with Edith and Miss Englefield. Her face was pale and rigid, but a faint smile lighted it up for a moment as she shook hands with me. She spoke hardly a word during my visit. Edith I saw was perpetually on the point of bursting into tears; and Miss Englefield was painfully restless and fidgety. Not a word was said on the subject of which the thoughts of us all were full. And so things went on for weeks afterwards. Helen grew thinner every day, and looked ill; but she was calm and self-possessed, though she never smiled, except with that strange melancholy smile which speaks more powerfully of deep-seated sorrow than the most violent outbreaks of distress. Miss Englefield gradually grew reconciled to her disappointment in her favourite Edward Churchill, and seemed to transfer all the affection she had lavished upon him to Helen. As to Edith, she was miserable at the thought of her brother's conduct; though I soon began to suspect, or to hope, that she was cherishing a feeling towards myself which tended wonderfully to soothe her aching heart.

Helen's disinclination for pleasure of every kind threw Edith more and more into my company; and whether or no Miss Englefield suspected what was going on, certainly the old lady did contrive to leave us frequently together to an extent worthy of the most match-making of managers.

As I grew more and more conscious of my attachment to Edith, a new difficulty began to spring up. Perhaps I was needlessly fastidious, but certainly I took it into my head that the knowledge I had obtained of Miss Englefield's original intentions towards Edith in conjunction with her brother, would make it seem as if I were seeking her for the sake of the fortune I had learnt that she would possess. To Edith herself I did not venture to give a hint of my scruples; on the contrary, I persuaded myself that I ought to draw back, if possible, and lessen my attentions to her by degrees. Pretty clumsily I managed it, I have no doubt; and the only result

was, that I made Edith as miserable as myself, until she began to pine and droop in a way that defied all Miss Englefield's questionings and speculations. In short, we managed at length to become as thoroughly uncomfortable and wretched a party as can be conceived. I could not keep away from Winterton; my father was frequently from home, and the solitude of Morley Court, as well as irresistible inclination, made me an almost daily visitor under Miss Englefield's roof.

The only really agreeable person who ever presented himself was Mr. Cumberland the priest. He got on extremely well with the old lady, who enjoyed his good-humour and cheerfulness excessively, and laughed heartily when he now and then bantered me on my sentimental solemnity, and looked at me with a pointed expression which made me blush up to the eyes. Now and then when I was walking with him, or calling at his house, he said some little thing which seemed to be an invitation to me to speak openly on my difficulties; but I kept them to myself, and he was too delicate in feeling to press the matter further.

Thus stood our affairs, when one day, on entering the drawing room at Winterton, I found Miss Englefield in tears, and Helen sitting by her, so flushed and animated that all appearance of illness and suffering was for the moment banished, and earnestly striving to comfort the sorrowing old lady.

"Oh! my dear, my dear!" cried Miss Englefield, "what a *hard* religion yours is! Why can't you be like other people? I can't understand all those enthusiastic notions of yours and Edith's. And Mr. Cumberland too! I am quite surprised at him; I thought *he* was too sensible for it. And you tell me he approves of this new scheme."

"Oh no!" exclaimed Helen, "not that. He only said that he *might* approve of it. He thinks that I *may* have a vocation, and therefore advises me to try; but even so he recommends me to wait a little longer, till—till—"

"Till what?" cried Miss Englefield.

"Till my mind, as he says, has got into a thoroughly healthy condition again, and I have recovered my strength also."

"Well, my dear," retorted Miss Englefield, "that may be all very well, and no doubt it is; but I don't understand these *vocations*, as you call them, at all. How are you to know the will of God? I should like to be told. I'm sure nobody can be better than you are, or more religious, or more dutiful; and why you must needs want to be a nun, I cannot conceive. Here I shall have Edith next wanting to run into a convent, and cut off that beautiful hair of hers. Besides, my dear, you know you'll be made a perfect fright. I've

seen nuns myself in my young days, when I have travelled abroad in Italy, and shocked I was, I assure you, to see what dresses they wore. Why a pretty young girl like you should want to disfigure herself in this way, is beyond *my* power to understand. Well, well! there's no accounting for young ladies' whims, after all. Only I do hope and pray you won't put any of these ideas into Edith's head."

"If I did," cried Helen, with a mischievous look at me, and the first true smile I had seen on her bright countenance for many a day,—“if I did, I suspect you would have one stout ally at least on your side, to persuade her not to listen to me.”

“What does she mean, Mr. Morley?” cried Miss Englefield, with a glance of surprise that made me fancy that she was guiltless of any suspicions of what was going on between Edith and myself.

“Oh, nothing, nothing!” responded Helen, with a look of pretended unconsciousness, while all the while she watched me closely from the corners of her eyes.

“Nothing! nothing!” echoed Miss Englefield; “you’re a very strange girl, Helen, I am sure. Why, Mr. Morley, you seem hot and tired; I hope you are not unwell. What’s the matter with him, Helen? he’s now as pale as a sheet.”

“Mr. Cumberland!” cried Miss Englefield’s precise old footman, throwing open the door, and introducing a visitor.

I never saw Miss Englefield receive Cumberland so stiffly. He was all smile and liveliness, and I felt positively provoked to see any one looking so perfectly contented in the midst of the troubles of other people. He must have seen how coldly his hostess welcomed him, but he took no notice, and chatted away as usual. Miss Englefield evidently imagined that he was come to speak about Helen’s wish to become a nun, for she looked as black as her sweet-tempered countenance could become, when, after a minute’s pause, he said:

“Miss Darnley, I met Miss Churchill in the garden, and she asked me to say that she should be very glad if you would join her there.”

This looked so like a hint for my departure also, that I rose to go, when Cumberland added:

“Pray don’t go, Morley; I am come on purpose to have a little conversation with you and Miss Englefield together.”

I looked at him with surprise, and Miss Englefield turned first to him, and then to me, and then again to Cumberland, who looked provokingly mysterious. As soon as Helen was gone, he resumed:

“This is a very foolish young fellow, Miss Englefield,”

said he, laying his hand on my shoulder, while I wondered what was to come next. The old lady seemed almost as much astonished as I was, and exclaimed:

"Sir?"

"Mr. Basil Morley is a very foolish young fellow, madam," repeated he; "and if it was not for sensible old folks like you and me, would be doing himself some serious mischief, not to mention the harm he would do to another young person in whom I know you take a deep interest."

"I don't know what you mean, sir," cried Miss Englefield, still totally in the dark.

"Well!" rejoined Cumberland, "I never should have guessed that you would not understand me. I felt certain that *you* knew it, for *my* eyes have told me the truth long ago. And I should have fancied that Miss Darnley might have suggested——"

"Pray, Mr. Cumberland, do be explicit at once," cried Miss Englefield, now plainly anticipating that it was Helen's taking the veil which the priest was come to talk about; "if you mean what Miss Darnley has herself told me, the less we say on a very disagreeable subject the better."

"A disagreeable subject, my dear madam!" repeated Cumberland, looking in his turn somewhat foolish and puzzled; "I had hoped that the subject would have been any thing but disagreeable. I am sure if I had thought otherwise, I would not have acceded to Mr. Morley's request, made only this morning."

"Mr. Morley's request!" echoed I, in my turn bewildered; "what *do* you mean? I never made any request of you this morning."

"But *your father* did, my good fellow," retorted Cumberland.

Miss Englefield's eyes and mouth were now open with astonishment; and as Cumberland again began to smile, she exclaimed:

"Mr. Morley! Helen Darnley! what in the name of patience have they to do with each other, Mr. Cumberland?"

"Nothing in the world, my dear madam," replied the priest; "I never said a word about Miss Darnley, except that I said I suppose she had told you."

"Told me *what*, Mr. Cumberland?" cried the old lady, absolutely impatiently.

"That our young friend here was in love with our other young friend, Miss Edith Churchill."

"Is *that* all?" cried Miss Englefield, actually jumping from her seat with surprise; while I exclaimed:

"Miss Englefield! Mr. Cumberland! this is all against *my* wishes. Really, Mr. Cumberland, this is going too far. I assure you, Miss Englefield—that—that—"

As I hesitated, Miss Englefield resumed:

"Well, Mr. Morley, what?"

"I assure you," I repeated, "that I do not—that I never—that I cannot;" and again I was silent.

"That you don't love Edith; is that it, Mr. Morley?" asked she.

"Come, come, my dear Morley," interrupted Cumberland, "don't be agitated or vexed. I assure you it will all be right in five minutes. The fact is, Miss Englefield, that our young friend's father has been letting me into a secret. He has told me (as his son first told him) the history of the mode in which Basil here became acquainted with your intentions respecting Miss Churchill in the disposition of your property. And he has taken it into his head, and has put the same notion into mine, that his son has got hold of some scruples or other about this fortune, which (we presume) you intend to leave to Miss Churchill. Pray pardon my abruptness and boldness in touching on such subjects; as we have the same object in view, I am sure you will pardon me for intruding on you. I would not have done it, but that I have seen for some time that *something* was going wrong among the young people; and that Mr. Morley would not be persuaded by me to undertake the business himself."

"Pray make no apology, Mr. Cumberland," said the good-natured old lady. "If the young folks cannot manage their own affairs for themselves, it is time for us old folks to come in and help them. But pray allow me to ask, before proceeding to business, whether it is a part of the office of the Catholic clergy to make matches among their flocks?"

"Why, not exactly, my dear madam," replied he; "and to tell you the truth, it is the first time I ever was employed in such an affair in my whole life, and unless you agree to the proposition I bring, I hope it may be the last."

"But how is this, sir?" rejoined Miss Englefield: "I thought you Catholics considered that every body ought to be a priest or a nun, and here are you actually arranging a marriage before my eyes. I suppose, then, that Helen Darnley is all in the wrong when she says that you advise her to go into a convent."

"Far from it, my dear madam," rejoined he.

"Then you *do* want Helen to be a nun!" exclaimed Miss Englefield.

"If Almighty God wills it," replied Cumberland, "cer-

tainly I do wish it, but not otherwise. It is simply a question of vocation."

"Vocation!" echoed Miss Englefield; "that's just what Helen says. Ah, well! I can't make it out at all. It was not so when I was young. But I am getting old, and the world, I suppose, is wiser now-a-days; though how a young girl can think she serves God better by cutting off her hair and making herself frightful, I *cannot* understand."

On tenterhooks as I was all through this conversation, I could scarcely keep my countenance at the turn it was taking, and I saw that Cumberland could hardly repress his smiles. To relieve himself, as I thought, he turned to me and said:

"Suppose you leave me and Miss Englefield alone for a few minutes. I am sure we shall soon settle matters quite satisfactorily."

I took the suggestion, and walked into the garden. There I sauntered to and fro, in as pretty a condition of nervousness as youthful lover ever endured. By and by I turned out of the path where I was walking to sit in an arbour near at hand. I was almost seated beneath its shade before I perceived that Edith herself was there before me. She looked pale and miserable. A rapid flush overspread her face as I sat down by her side. Neither of us spoke. At last she began:

"You seem not well this morning, Mr. Morley."

"What *shall* I do?" I said to myself. "Well, it is sure to be all out soon, and I may as well speak for myself."

While I was thus pondering, Edith of course began to wonder at my silence, and repeated her question.

"Quite well, thank you," I replied, "so far as health goes, but not very well in mind."

She evidently misunderstood my meaning, for she turned suddenly round and looked me in the face with an expression of unaffected and sad interest, while she rejoined:

"Not well in mind, Mr. Morley? you frighten me. Surely it cannot be any trouble about religious questions."

"None in the world," I replied, almost smiling at her misinterpretation. "My troubles are about myself and —"

I took her hand in my own as I spoke. In a moment she fathomed all my meaning, and began trembling violently, as she withdrew her hand, and fixed her eyes on the ground.

"Miss Churchill!" I went on. "Edith, whatever may be your feelings, have pity on me, and hear all I have to tell you."

She made no reply, nor gave any sign of a wish to go, though more agitated than before. I was beginning to speak

again, when footsteps were heard near, and in a moment who should stand before us but Cumberland and Miss Englefield?

Cumberland smiled a mischievous smile, as he turned to his companion and said:

"I fear, my dear madam, we are intruders here. After all, perhaps the principals in this affair will have arranged every thing to their satisfaction without our meddling in it. Suppose we leave them, and take a turn through your pleasant shrubberies."

Edith gazed at him, as he spoke, with undisguised amazement; Miss Englefield's face absolutely shone with satisfaction and kindness; I felt as like a simpleton as any young man nearer twenty than thirty years of age can possibly feel; while the priest put on a look of unconscious innocence which has made me laugh many and many a time since at the bare remembrance of it.

"Come, Mr. Cumberland," at last said the old lady, "you don't know much about these things, though I really am infinitely obliged to you for what you have done. Suppose you take the gentleman, while I take the lady, and we will each tell them the results of our conference. Come, Edith, my child, give me your arm. I'm glad *you* are not going to be a nun with poor dear Helen. Come in-doors with me, and hear what I have to say to you. And you, Mr. Morley, be a sensible man, and listen for once to an heretical old lady when she bids you obey your priest in what he has to tell you."

With that she led Edith away, and Cumberland sat down by my side. What he had to tell, every body but myself would naturally have guessed; though I was too much astonished at this singular mode of carrying on a love-affair to be able very accurately to calculate on probabilities. The upshot of his conversation with Miss Englefield was, that he, as my father's representative, and she, as a kind of guardian of Edith, had quietly arranged the preliminaries of a marriage between us. All my doubts as to Edith herself, Cumberland laughed at as absurd. He declared he could trust his own eyes, and that Miss Englefield, when the matter was once suggested to her, had recalled many a look and word of Miss Churchill's, which convinced them both that I should have no difficulties in that quarter. And so, in discussion, and protestations on my part, with thanks to Cumberland for his kindness, and expressions of astonishment at his penetration, together with an abundance of all the incoherent nonsense which might be expected from a person in my situation, we passed an hour. Cumberland then took his leave, and I went into the house. In a few minutes Miss Englefield entered the drawing-room,

with Edith leaning on her arm, pale, and her eyes shewing signs of many tears. The old lady took Edith's hand and placed it in mine; and one glance at Edith's countenance assured me that all was well. What passed during the rest of the day was as little worth recording as any thing that ever took place between persons whose hearts were full.

Of course many days did not elapse before *I* suggested the propriety of fixing some period for the wedding. To my surprise I found an unexpected ally in my wishes to avoid needless delay in Helen Darnley. A singular kind of cheerfulness and animation had now succeeded to Helen's past despondency. From the moment that she had made up her mind to leave the world and enter religion, a new life had sprung up within her heart; and occupied as I was in dreams and realities of another kind, I yet found leisure to observe how strikingly all the energy and vivacity of her character was developed under her new prospects. Her dimmed beauty, indeed, bore the marks of the sufferings she had undergone: her complexion had lost some little measure of its brilliant clearness, the light-hearted merriment which had been wont to shine out in her laugh and smile was exchanged for a more earnest though not less cheerful gaiety; and the jesting with which she now and then alluded to the ravages of *time* (as she declared it to be) in her glossy hair, found confirmation in the occasional mixture of a grey hair where all had been dark and shining. Edith often told me of the increasing length of the time which Helen began to give to her private devotions. She took a great interest in all that related to Edith and myself, but it was clear that *nothing* in this world had now any real attractions for her. She had set her heart upon receiving the habit as a novice in ——— convent on the day of our wedding, and with this object in view she soon joined warmly in my petitions for an early fixing of the time. Edith, however, held firm to a delay of three months, having first stood out for six; and so at length it was arranged.

Brightly and peacefully did those three months flow on; once more agitation became a stranger to my heart. Every thing smiled around and within me. My father and Miss Englefield (who now professedly regarded Edith as her daughter) made the most liberal pecuniary marriage settlements upon us. Edith's father was fully as cordial as we could have anticipated. He confirmed his intentions of leaving Edith nothing in his will, nor would he give her a solitary sixpence during his life; but a handsome gift or two, and a kind letter, testified to the existence of some remains of fatherly affection.

Thus I seemed to possess the fulness of prosperity, both spiritual and temporal. The glories, the depths, and the consolations of Catholicism day by day opened themselves more and more upon my mind. Edith was, as Mr. Cumberland repeatedly said of her, the very model of a devout Catholic; and I really believe that I passed through that most trying time in a person's life, the period between the engagement and the marriage, with as little disturbance to the ordinary course of my religious life as most persons.

At length the wedding-day arrived. We were married very early in the morning, in order to allow us to be present at the ceremony of Helen's clothing as a novice in ——— convent, where we drove direct from the chapel-door, the convent being but a few miles distant. Helen, henceforth to be Sister Agnes, appeared to have regained all the brilliancy of her old beauty. Her composure and cheerfulness were marvellous, and as it was the first time that I had ever been present at such a scene, its effect on my mind was absolutely overpowering. My father, who every day grew less and less of a Protestant, was present; and nothing would satisfy Miss Englefield but that she would be present also. The poor old lady was distressed beyond measure; but she had made up her mind, and she said not an unkind word. When the ceremony was over, the good-natured conversation of some of the nuns, with whom we spent a short time in the convent-parlour, revived her while it puzzled her. Her astonishment at their habit and their general proceedings was passing away, and she was getting on admirably with the superioress, when Helen entered clothed in her novice's habit. She stood a moment or two before Miss Englefield, who gazed at her with bewilderment, evidently hardly recognising her.

"What, don't you know me?" cried Sister Agnes.

It was too much for the old lady's heart. She burst into tears, threw herself on the neck of the young religious, and wept aloud. We all began to shew signs of weeping in sympathy, when Sister Agnes, laughing through her tears, exclaimed:

"Come, this is a sad commencement for the married life of Mr. and Mrs. Basil Morley."

We started at the words; Miss Englefield sighed dismally; and in a few minutes we had taken our leave.

"Well, well, my dears," said Miss Englefield, as we drove from the convent-gate, "yours *is* a strange religion. They seem very nice ladies though, those friends of Helen's, and I hope they will make her comfortable and happy; but why do they cut off her hair?"

ST. PUDENTIANA AND HER ROMAN CHURCH.

THE *titular* churches of Rome are subdivided into episcopal, sacerdotal, and diaconal. The episcopal titular churches are five, and are without the walls of the city. The sacerdotal titular churches are forty-eight in number. Perhaps the most remarkable of these forty-eight churches is the church of St. Pudentiana. An extraordinary degree of interest attaches itself to this church from the fact of its being built on the spot where St. Peter lodged when at Rome, as also from its being one of the most ancient churches in the world. To us, however, and in these days, it is doubly interesting, from the circumstances that the saint to whom it is dedicated was the daughter of an English lady, and that it has been assigned by the holy Father for the cardinalitial title of our much-esteemed Metropolitan.

At the battle fought, A.D. 50, between the Roman invaders and the native British, at Caer-Caradoc in Shropshire, the British chieftian, Caractacus, was worsted. His wife and daughter fell into the hands of the victors. His brothers soon after surrendered, and he himself was betrayed by his step-mother, and delivered in chains to the representative of the Roman emperor. They were taken to the imperial city, and paraded before Claudius the emperor. The arms and the ornaments of the British prince were borne before him; next followed his wife, daughter, and brothers; lastly came Caractacus himself, lost in wonder that men who possessed such palaces at home, should deem it worth their while to fight for the wretched hovels of Britain. Claudius received him graciously, restored him to liberty, and reinstated him into a portion of his territories.

His daughter, however, remained at Rome. Her name was Claudia—a name assumed probably in compliment to the emperor, from whom she received her liberty. Claudia is celebrated for her beauty by Martial (*Epigr.* lib. ix.). She became the wife of the Roman senator Pudens. She and her husband are mentioned by St. Paul in the fourth chapter of his second epistle to Timothy: “Eubulus and *Pudens*, and Linus and *Claudia*, and all the brethren salute thee,” v. 21. This proves that Claudia, the wife of Pudens, was a Christian. That she was a Briton has been already shewn: to which evidence we may add the testimony of Martial:

“Claudia, Rufe, meo nubit peregrina Pudenti.
Claudia cœruleis cum sit Rufina Britannis
Edita.”

Epigr. iv. 13, vi. 53.

There is more probability in the conjecture that she embraced the Christian faith in Rome, than that she became a Christian in Britain.

The house of the senator Pudens was situated in the valley between the Esquiline and Viminal hills, in the street now called the *Via Urbana*, or *Via di Pudenziana*, on the spot where now stands the church of St. Pudentiana.

Pudens and his wife Claudia had four children, St. Novatus, St. Timothy, St. Praxedes, and St. Pudentiana. It is recorded by a very ancient and credible tradition, that St. Peter was received into his house by the senator Pudens;* that he baptised Pudens and all his family; and that the apostle there laid the foundation of the Roman church. Probably the conversion of Claudia may date from the same event. Upon the spot is still preserved a large portion of the wooden altar upon which St. Peter, during his stay with Pudens, offered up the adorable sacrifice. It is kept in the chapel of St. Peter, under the altar.

The learned Bollandists have compiled the documents that relate the acts of the holy virgins St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedes. When the wicked Nero sought to blot out the name of Christianity, and persecuted the Church of Christ, many martyrs obtained the crown promised by the Lord to those that love Him. SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes waited upon the martyrs, encouraging them to suffer cheerfully; and after their martyrdom collected their blood and relics. In the church of St. Pudentiana is the dry well into which she and her sister collected the relics of about 3000 martyrs; and in the church of St. Praxedes is still kept the sponge that she used to collect the blood of the martyrs. There may be no violence in the conjecture that the pious deeds of these Romano-British virgins paved the way towards the conversion of Britain.

They died as they had lived, and in death they were not separated. Both were buried together in the catacombs on the Salarian road.† In the church of St. Pudentiana is kept and shewn a fragment of the original sepulchral tablet, found in the catacombs belonging to the grave of St. Pudentiana, of which the inscription, conformable in its style and execution to the manner of the early Christians, is not altogether legible,

* This would not be St. Peter's first visit to Rome. He went to Rome first in the year 42, the second year of the reign of Claudius; but at that date Claudia was still in Britain.

† These catacombs are known as the cemetery of "Santa Priscilla," who was the mother of Pudens, to whom the ground formerly belonged. They are about a mile from the city-gate, on the Salarian road.

though the words "*bene merenti Cornelia Pudenziana*," and the age 47, may be read distinctly. Both are now in heaven, where they rest from their labours.

An account of the church that gives its title to an English Cardinal cannot be devoid of interest. The church of St. Pudentiana stands in the Via Urbina, or Via di Pudenziana, a street in the hollow between the Viminal and Esquiline hills, and near St. Mary Major's. It occupies the site of the house of Pudens the senator; although some persons have supposed the site to be not that of the house of Pudens, but of the baths of his son Novatus. Pope St. Pius I., about the year 145, converted the house into an oratory dedicated to St. Pudentiana. We know nothing further of its changes or history till the year 1130, when it was given by Innocent II. to canons regular. Several Pontiffs subsequently repaired the church. The church as it now stands is of the date 1597, when it was restored, *i.e.* nearly built anew, by Cardinal Enrico Caetani at his own expense, under the architect Francesco da Volterra. Portions, however, of the earlier church exist, and consist of a square brick tower, or campanile, annexed to the building, and considerable remains of a large ancient brick building, that forms the substructure of a portion of the church. This old masonry is considered to be of the first century, and may have been part of the house of Pudens.

St. Pius V. transferred the church to the Dominican penitentiaries of St. Mary Major's, and united it to that basilica; the chapter of which officiate in it on the feast-day, May 19, the feast of St. Pudentiana. Sixtus V. gave it to the Bernardines or Cistercians, in 1568; but it now is in the hands of the canonesses of St. Augustine.

The plan of the church consists of a nave with aisles (east and west) and choir. The nave is divided from the aisles by seven ancient columns, of bigio marble, said to have belonged to the house of Pudens. The three first spaces between the pillars, on each side, have been filled up with a brick wall. The roof of the nave is vaulted. Two objects in the nave arrest the attention of every beholder: one is a marble tablet upon a spot in the pavement close to the entrance, with the following Latin inscription, relating to the original dedication of the church by Pius I., and to the remains of the bodies of three thousand martyrs piously collected by St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedes, and buried with their own hands: "In hac sancta antiquissima ecclesia, T.T.S. Pastoris A. S. Pio Papa dedicata, olim domo S. Pudentis senatoris, et hospitio sanctorum Apostolorum, tria millia beatorum virgi-

num corpora requiescunt, quæ sanctæ Christi virgines Pudentiana et Praxedes suis manibus sepeliebant." With reference to this inscription it may be well to remark, that it was, in the very early ages, called the church "of the Pastor," in allusion to St. Peter; and from the inscription just quoted it would seem that St. Paul had also resided in it.

The other remarkable object is at the far end of the nave—a dry well, protected by an iron grating three or four feet high, sanctified by having been the receptacle of the blood and of the relics of about 3000 martyrs, collected by St. Pudentiana and her pious sister. Upon the gable wall of the church may be seen two pictures, in fresco, by Reti; and in the one on the left hand of the entrance-door, SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes are represented as engaged in this last office of piety. Over the holy-water vat, to the right, is a painting, also by Reti, of St. Peter baptising Pudens.

The right aisle, or east aisle (for the church faces north and south), contains three side chapels, divided by partition walls, and a fourth at the end of the aisle. The *first*, or south-east chapel, is remarkably plain and simple. The roof is a groined vault, with ornaments of coloured stucco. Over its altar is an angel-guardian, a copy from the original of A. Grammatica. The *second* chapel has the pediment of its altar resting on columns of bianco e nero marble. The altar-piece is a Madonna and Child of an ancient school; but the Birth of the B. V. Mary to the right, and that of the Redeemer to the left, and the other paintings, are by Lazaro Baldi. The *third* chapel has over its altar a St. Bernard, whose pen is guided by the B. Virgin; and the same Saint before the Eternal Father, to the right, and the St. Theresa in ecstasy, to the left, are by M. Cippitelli. The *chapel at the northern end of the nave* is dedicated to St. Pudente. A considerable portion of the pavement outside it is composed of rough mosaic, of small uniform pieces of yellow tile. The picture of St. Peter baptising St. Pudente is by A. Nucci. Underneath the plain altar is a large marble flag that covers the entrance to the crypt below, the cemetery of the nuns. The vestry is at the east side of this chapel.

The left aisle, or west aisle, contains but one side chapel, and one chapel at its north end. The side chapel belongs to the family of the founder of the church, Cardinal Caetani. A great part of the pavement outside is composed of the same rough mosaic already mentioned. At its entrance are four Corinthian columns, incrusting with giallo antico marble. The chapel is square, and the pavement is of inlaid marble. The roof is supported by four arches that form the four sides of

the chapel, and is richly decorated with gilded carving, with mosaics by P. Rossetto, from the cartoons of F. Zuccari. On the wall to the right of the altar is a monument of a Cardinal Caetani, who deceased in 1688; and on the left wall is the monument of the restorer of the church, Cardinal Caetani. Above each of these monuments the scarlet hat of the deceased Cardinal still remains suspended. Both monuments are similar, consisting principally of a sarcophagus of breccia nera e gialla, with a bust of white marble, surmounted by a pediment bearing on its extremities a pair of reclining angels, and supported on a pair of columns of verde antico, with torus and plinth of white marble, on a base of very fine Porta Santa. Each monument is flanked by two marble figures in niches. The first one to the right on entering the chapel is "Fortitude," by a pupil of Guidi; and the second is "Temperance," by A. Lorenese. The first to the left is "Justice," by Carlo Malavista; and the second "Prudence," by F. Mari. The pediment of the altar is supported on a pair of composite columns of a rare lumachella marble, called Pietra Pidocchio, with gilded capitals. The altar-piece is not a painting, but a very fine bas-relief, in white marble, of the nativity of our blessed Saviour.

The chapel of St. Peter is at the north end of the west aisle. Upon the wall to the left of the entrance is the fragment of the monumental slab belonging to the grave of St. Pudentiana, found in the catacombs, and already described. The life of St. Peter is illustrated in frescoes, on its roof, by Baglioni. Under the altar-slab is preserved a most remarkable relic, *i. e.* the wooden altar upon which St. Peter offered the adorable sacrifice whilst he lived in the house of Pudens. An inscription on a tablet of black marble on the right of the altar informs the visitor that "In hoc altare sanctus Petrus, pro vivis et defunctis, ad augendam fidelium multitudinem, corpus et sanguinem Domini offerebat." Above the altar is a bas-relief, in white marble, by G. B. Della Porta, representing St. Peter kneeling to receive the keys from our blessed Saviour.

We may now pass from the description of the nave, with its aisles and side chapels, to speak of the choir or sanctuary. The choir is raised two steps above the nave. Its roof is a flat dome, and the concave of the dome or cupola, as also the spandrels of the four supporting arches, are painted by Pomerancio. At the end of the choir the high altar is contained within an apse. The mosaic, in the apse above the altar, is supposed to be of the early date of the ninth century, and a first-rate specimen of mosaic work of that period.

It represents our Lord enthroned, with a book in his hand, on which is written, "*Dominus Conservator Ecclesiæ Pudentianæ.*" The altar-piece is a picture of St. Pudentiana; and by its side are pictures of St. Novatus and St. Timothy, her brothers, all by Bernardino Nocchi of Lucca.

Two or three memorials of the holy family of Pudens, existing in the church of St. Praxedes, on the Esquiline, near St. Mary Major's, call for a passing notice. The sponge used by St. Praxedes to collect the blood of the martyrs is kept in the tribune, beneath which is a painting of St. Praxedes by D. Muratori. In the middle of the nave, directly opposite the entrance, is the well in which SS. Pudentiana and Praxedes deposited the relics of the martyrs, with their blood, collected by means of sponges. The well is surrounded by a solid marble balustrade three or four feet high, hexagonal in form. It is at present blocked up with an artificial bottom and side lining of marble, to a depth of three or four feet below the pavement. Within the well is a wooden effigy representing St. Praxedes on her knees squeezing a sponge, saturated with the blood of the martyrs, into a basin, in allusion to the practice of herself and sister, who used to collect the bodies of all the Christian martyrs they could find, and mingle the blood of the faithful in the holy well, after consigning their relics to the earth. One of the sides of the balustrade has the following inscription :

"Quem pia Praxedes collegit in urbe cruorem
Fusum a martyribus, fudit in hunc puteum :
Ut quæ patricio fuerat de sanguine clara,
Esset, collecto sanguine, clara magis."

In the left-hand aisle, on the gable wall, there is a rude fresco representing St. Praxedes sleeping on a slab. Underneath it, and fixed to the wall, is a slab of stone, said to have been her bed; to which is added the inscription: "*Sopra questo marmo dormiva la santa vergine Prassede.*"

A crypt or confessional extends twenty yards or more underneath the choir. Ten steps lead down into it, at the bottom of which is the door opening into it. It contains at the end a small plain altar; and at the sides are four stone coffins, upon one of which is a short inscription, stating that the bodies of the Saints Praxedes and Pudentiana repose within.

Such is a brief outline of the history of the family of the Roman senator Pudens, and of the church in the capital of the Christian world dedicated to St. Pudentiana, that gives its title to our English Cardinal. Few churches are held in

higher esteem by the Roman people; none more eagerly resorted to by the British traveller who makes a pilgrimage of devotion to Rome. Had the whole of the forty-eight sacerdotal titular churches been vacant when an English Cardinal was made, the holy Father could not have chosen one more appropriate for him than the title of St. Pudentiana. We feel grateful for this paternal proof of his love towards England in the choice. Who knows but that the conversion of England may be very much accelerated thereby? St. Pudentiana must have always felt an especial interest in the country that gave her mother birth. Now that interest will be, if possible, increased, because her church is presided over by an English Cardinal. St. Peter must have always held this country in affection; and for one reason among a thousand, because he was entertained at Rome by a British matron; and the good daughters of this British lady ministered to the early martyrs, collected their blood, and gave burial to their relics. Could any thing increase this affection, it would be, that the spot where he lodged at Rome, now a church, has become the titular of a Cardinal belonging to the country that gave the hospitable Claudia and her saintly family to Rome. England gave to Pagan Rome the daughter of one of its sturdy chieftains, who became the wife of the first Christian senator, and the mother of four saints; who, not forgetting hospitality, being not aware of it, entertained an angel in the person of the prince of the apostles (Heb. xiii. 2), and who, through the instrumentality of the Apostle, received the grace of conversion and the peace of the Gospel, as Christ had ordered his Apostles. "And into whatsoever city or town you shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till you go thence. And when you come into the house, salute it, saying: Peace be to this house. And if that house be worthy, *your peace shall come upon it*" (Matt. x. 11, &c.). In return, Christian Rome adds one of England's sons to the Sacred College of Cardinals, and in giving him a title from this church, makes it his privilege to be *Conservator Ecclesiæ Pudentiænæ*.

Poetry.

GOD WITH US.

BENEATH these airy vaults of carven stone,
 Among the many pillars ranged afar,
 Ever the Presence dwells, calm and alone ;
 Kingly and calm—as a pure distant star
 Looketh serenely from its silent throne,
 And thrills from the abodes where the Immortal are.

No voice, no form ; but as o'er boundless hills
 Sweet universal winds pass on unseen,
 Yet rippling visibly a myriad rills
 And the soft endless solitudes of green ;
 So o'er a thousand hearts and yielding wills
 He breathes, and all are bless'd—none knows how it hath been.

As eyes replete with an enamour'd woe
 Come haunting darkness, and no rest allow
 To one that still remembers ; even so
 The power of deepest looks lies on us now
 From the Unseen, and through the stillness flow
 Murmurs that sweetly tell why once He died and how.

Thou art gone hence, we see Thee now no more !
 Away in far infinity Thou art ;
 But love and power are thine ! We cannot soar
 O'er the dread gulfs that us and Godhead part,
 But Thou walk'st to us on the waves that roar,
 Glid'st vision-like to aid, and liftest the faint heart.

Absence and presence Thou unit'st in one ;
 Thy blessed brow, the rainbow-light that springs
 From the Five Wounds, the lightning-gleams that run
 Obedient round Thee, and the clouds of wings
 Cluster'd like doves around the central sun,
 Ah, these o'erwhelm ; too wondrous dazzling things !

Therefore Thou linger'st 'mongst the feeble race,
 Through mystic twilight all unseen, yet known.
 Thou art away—we pine and pray for grace ;
 Thou art so near—we faint not as alone :
 Too little, for Thou spak'st of face to face,
 Enough—enough to bless and to sustain thine own !

R. M.

Reviews.

ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE ON ERASTIANISM.

A Sketch of the History of Erastianism. By Robert Isaac Wilberforce, A.M., Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire. London, Murray.

THIS little work is on a subject-matter always interesting, but especially so in the actual state of the Anglican communion. The name and high position of the author have induced us to read it carefully, and we shall begin our remarks by letting him set forth his own view in his own words, pointing out afterwards wherein that view is inadequate.

"By Erastianism," says the author, "I understand that system of opinions, and that course of action, which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into the function of the civil government. It is the more needful to consider the nature of this system, because by many it has been supposed to be involved in an admission of the royal supremacy, since it has often been supposed that the Church of England designed to surrender her liberty to the temporal power, and that the clergy are inconsistent when they assert their independence. But the characteristic features and essential principle of Erastianism can hardly be understood without some knowledge of the circumstances which have led to its prevalence. For this purpose we must go back to those great events which convulsed Europe during the sixteenth century. I propose, then, to consider, first, what principles of Church authority were engendered either here or abroad by the Reformation; secondly, how these principles gave birth to the system of Erastianism; thirdly, what effects have followed from its predominance."

The author, accordingly, pursues this inquiry in three chapters, in which he respectively sets forth three different systems as to the distribution of Church authority between the spiritual and the temporal power, which he considers to have prevailed successively since the Reformation. The first of these he calls "the Episcopal system;" the second, "the Territorial system, or Erastianism;" the third, "the Consistorial system, or the effects of Erastianism."

The "Episcopal system," which he considers to have prevailed for some time in Germany after the Reformation (though so far as regards that country it is surely a misnomer), and in England from 1534 to 1688, "implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king" (p. 41). "The royal co-operation was supposed to confer that com-

pleteness on the national Church, the possession of which made its sentence equivalent to the sentence of the Church universal in its power of binding the consciences of the king's subjects" (p. 46). "It was an alliance between the clergy and the crown, by which each party gained protection against those opposite enemies, the Presbyterians and the Pope. The Church's courts were protected by the royal power; while, on the other hand, the prince's authority was sustained by the co-operation of his native clergy" (p. 25); and more particularly, dividing Church authority into "a question of persons and a question of things;" as to the former, the crown "left the ministration of orders untouched." Whether it arrogated mission to itself, he would seem to leave doubtful; "the question of communion was supposed to be left as formerly to the courts of the Bishops," and "the right of patronage was rested on the fact of ancient endowment" (p. 13), while as to the latter, the author dwells much on the declaration of the twentieth Anglican article, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith;" seems doubtful in what proportions this so-called Church authority was divided between the crown and the clergy, but states that, "impossible as it is to discern how much was to be ascribed to the one, and how much to the other authority, nothing can be clearer than that the two, taken collectively, were supposed to possess a final power in the interpretation of doctrine" (p. 21).

There appears to us considerable indistinctness in this view of things, and one important error as to fact, which we shall hereafter point out; but here our object is to state the author's meaning.

In the second chapter he traces how both in Germany and in England the "Episcopal system" was destined to change into the "Territorial," of which the "principle was that the consent of the clergy was not required for the settlement of questions of doctrine, which must be decided exclusively by the temporal power" (p. 33). This system he considers identical with that of "Thomas Lieber, or Erastus, as he called himself, a physician and professor of Heidelberg, born A.D. 1524," who taught "that the civil magistrate has not only a peculiar commission, as being invested by divine appointment with a place in the Church's administration (which the episcopal system was ready to allow), but that he possesses this power by inherent authority, whether he be a Christian or no; and further, that he is not bound to refer to the Church, as directed by supernatural guidance in the discovery of truth" (p. 36). Omitting the introduction of this system into Germany, we will pass to his review of those "influences which have tended

to introduce that Territorial or Erastian system in England, which the combination of Pietism and Liberalism rendered prevalent in Germany" (p. 41). And here he considers that "two especial causes have been at work, the first in the age of the Tudors and Stuarts, the second in that of their successors: the first, the ancient belief in the divine right of kings; the second, the modern disbelief in the divine right of the Church. It was shewn that the Episcopal system implied the union of two authorities, that of the priesthood and that of the king: to exalt the kingly, or to break down the priestly authority, was alike fatal therefore to the ancient theory, because it destroyed the harmony of its parts; so that both tendencies led to an undue exaltation of the temporal power, or to the adoption of Erastianism." This influence, exerted by the notion of the divine right of kings, is traced out very effectively from p. 41 to p. 60, and the progress of disbelief in the divine right of the Church, with its results, from p. 61 to 70.

In the third chapter he treats of the "Consistorial system, or the effects of Erastianism," for "the Episcopal system has given way, both at home and in Germany, to pure Erastianism. It remains to observe the effects of the alteration in either country" (p. 78). And here the progress of things in Germany affords an instructive comment on their course in England. "Now to suppose," says our author, "that man's faith is to be taken blindly from the ruler under whose control he lives; that each sovereign has a right to prescribe such a religion as he pleases, and that his subjects are bound in conscience to accept it, (which is the Territorial system, or Erastianism), all this is so contrary to the first instincts of nature, that it is impossible that men should submit to it without reluctance. Those who receive the teaching of the Church, believe that she has promise of guidance from God's enlightening Spirit; but no such claim is even advanced by the parties who wield the civil sword. On this ground, then, the Territorial system was opposed by Pfaff, the learned chancellor of Tübingen, who describes it as 'that worst pest of the Church, a Cæsaropapacy.' In place of it he introduced what he called 'the Consistorial system;' viz. the theory that 'the prince's interference in Church matters was not derived either from hereditary right, or from territorial supremacy, but from the free concession of the people' (p. 79). "Now this power might be supposed to belong to the body of the people, either by natural right, or by divine institution. The last is the theory of Presbyterianism, which has prevailed in all Protestant countries where the crown did not favour the Reformation, and those who have

adopted it still retain (as in Scotland) their ancient hostility to the royal supremacy." But the other theory, that of the Consistorial system, "asserted Church authority to rest upon the mutual consent of men, when they entered into relations with one another as members of the same nation" (p. 80); and where this is "laid down as supplying the general theory of Church authority, the notion that the Church claims any divine guidance must be abandoned" (p. 82); so that this is identical with Rationalism. So much for Germany.

But now, "to turn to our own country. It may seem extraordinary that a nation so jealous of their liberties as the English should be content to renounce the most precious part of the heritage of men. For it has been shewn in the last chapter that at present it rests with the sovereign to explain finally what is the mind of the Church of England. The royal authority, when exercised in hearing appeals from the ecclesiastical courts, is not concerned with questions of property, but goes directly to the settlement of spiritual matters themselves. How can this be doubted, since it is plainly the Church's duty to correct erroneous teaching; and there is no question of any kind, which can arise in any court of the Church, which is brought for final adjudication to any other tribunal? So that either the Church herself exercises no religious authority, or religious authority is exercised by the prince. For every authority which the one exercises in inferior processes is exercised in the highest instance by the other. The legislature, while vesting in the sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed, lays down with fearful exactness the breadth of that authority with which he is entrusted. * * * But if the civil judge undertakes to decide respecting the spiritual question itself, he usurps functions which belong to another department; so that the independent existence of the spiritual society is virtually denied" (p. 82-4).

But now, "how does it happen that the English people acquiesce so readily in such an interference with the rights of conscience? Because the assertion of the unfettered liberty of individual belief has made many persons indifferent through what means the Church expresses her judgment. If they felt bound in conscience to respect her decisions, it would be of some moment by whom they were made; but why should men feel anxious about the decisions of a judge, in whom they recognise no authority? Again, the power which was formerly vested in the person of the sovereign is now held in common among the king and the estates of the realm, and is exercised practically by the minister who has the confidence of the representatives of the people. While the determination of doctrine rests nominally therefore with the sovereign, it depends really on the popular opinion of the day. And this is exactly that arrangement which Pfaff suggested as accounting for the state of

things in Germany, and which he called the Consistorial system. So that while the forms of the Territorial system have remained, we have passed in reality to that other order of things, which has been shewn to be so intimately allied with Rationalism. The world in general, however, feels little repugnance at leaving the decision of religious questions to the sovereign power, because the sovereign power is virtually 'their noble selves.' The decision in Church matters on late occasions has avowedly been less influenced by the strict rules of law than by a reference to public opinion; and thus the formal Erastianism of our position is made tolerable by that virtual deference to the public sentiment, which is the essential feature of the Consistorial system."

Now, so far we have endeavoured to sum up, with scrupulous correctness, the author's own view of the Anglican relations between Church and State in these three periods: the first, which followed the Reformation; the second, which was introduced by the Revolution; and the third, which comprises our own times. We can keenly sympathise with what it has cost him to enter on so unpleasant a subject, to enter on it with courage and determined honesty; and to make statements so bitterly unpalatable to the communion of which he is an ornament. We feel for the son who has been called by an inexorable duty to probe the deep and deadly wound of a mother. We fervently pray that his feelings may be relieved by the discovery hereafter that the supposed parent was but an adventuress—a monarch's cast-off mistress, now in her dishonourable age vainly striving to cover her nakedness with the gifts which purchased her seduction—who stole him in his infancy from his true mother, and is unable to satisfy the yearnings of his manhood.

For to his *principles* throughout we have happily nothing to object, nor, again, as to the practical condition in which he considers his communion to lie, disastrous enough, even pitiable, if one might pity the enemy of God. But there is one point in which we think his view is radically defective, as to the distribution of authority between the Crown and the clergy at the Reformation. All the evils which he now deplores, that "renouncing the most precious part of the heritage of men," that "vesting in the sovereign the whole appellate jurisdiction of which a patriarch could be possessed," "that vital denial of the independent existence of the spiritual society" (pp. 82-4), follow from and are involved in that distribution of authority which was originally made. Yet of this he speaks doubtfully. "It is impossible to say how much was intended to be assigned to the clergy, and how much to the crown, because the partition was neither fixed

by law nor explained in theory. It was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers" (p. 19). On the contrary, to us it appears that nothing can be more fixed, clear, and certain than this partition. Let us take Mr. Wilberforce's own criterion. "Let it once be admitted that spiritual mission is derived from the temporal power, and then it is plain that the authority which commits a trust has a right to withhold it, it will follow that to decide upon the doctrinal competency of those who are employed to teach belongs to the civil, and not to the spiritual power. And thus will the determination of doctrine become a matter of worldly cognisance, instead of being committed by inalienable right to Christ's spiritual body" (p. 18).

Therefore, in Mr. Wilberforce's judgment, which every Catholic theologian will confirm, all depends on the question from whom, after the settlement of the Reformation, the power of spiritual mission was derived in the Anglican Church.

But what is spiritual mission? Every Catholic will answer, that it is part of the power of spiritual jurisdiction, which assigns the conditions for *legitimate exercise* of the powers bestowed in orders; that is, it gives faculties to the priest, it confirms the bishop, it circumscribes the dioceses of bishops; it is the power, in short, which sets in motion, and preserves in its due action, the whole hierarchy or imperium of the Church. Nothing can be more simple, or more absolutely a first principle of Catholic theology.

But Mr. Wilberforce somehow shrinks from the use of the term 'spiritual jurisdiction,' and gives a definition of mission which seems to betray the usual Anglican inaccuracy. The Crown, he says (p. 13), "left the ministration of orders untouched." This, putting out of view the question of the validity of orders given by the Edwardian ritual, is admitted by Catholics. But further, "mission may mean either the spiritual commission which is derived from the Church, or the temporal permission to live in a certain locality. There might have been a more direct statement, that the Crown did not arrogate to itself the first; but there is no direct assertion which attributes to it more than the second." Now mission cannot mean "the temporal permission to live in a certain locality," for this is indisputably possessed by the temporal power in every state, Catholic, Protestant, or Heathen; by the Emperor in China, and the Grand Signor in Turkey, as well as by the temporal governments of Austria or of England. Certainly it was not for denying this that More and Fisher laid their heads on the block, nor for claiming it that Henry VIII. incurred excommunication. But perhaps by

the term "spiritual commission which is derived from the Church," which he elsewhere calls "the *continuance* of the commission bestowed in ordination" (p. 3), he means what a Catholic means by jurisdiction, *i. e.* the lawful exercise of the powers of order, and the having subjects whereon to exercise them. But then there is every legal proof that the Crown *did* arrogate to itself this power; that is, it claimed to be the fountain head of all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, nor did it only claim but became so by act of parliament, and has continued to be so, with the intermission of Mary's reign, to the present day. So far from not asserting, as Mr. Wilberforce will have it, it passed from assertion into action. This usurpation of the State begins with, and is plainly involved in, the statute of appeals, where the realm of England is stated to be "an empire, governed by one supreme head and king; unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality, were bounden and sworn to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." Now the king is indeed head of all persons spiritual and temporal, in their quality of citizens, and accordingly all, whether spiritual or temporal, owe him natural and humble obedience, *in the order of matters civil*; but he is not head of the spirituality *qua* spirituality, nor do spiritual persons owe him natural and humble obedience *in the order of matters spiritual*. For to assert this comes exactly to Mr. Wilberforce's definition of Erastianism, *viz.* "a system of opinions and course of action which deprive the Church of Christ of independent existence, and resolve it into a function of the civil government." For the possession of the divine powers conferred by ordination, when the use and exercise of those powers are directed and circumscribed by the State, does not leave to the Church an independent existence; and even real bishops, when confirmed in their sees by the civil power, and so deriving their spiritual jurisdiction from that power unto the several authorities dependent on them, become a function of the temporal government. Now the Anglican reformation was but the carrying out of this idea. Thus Bishop Gibson in his *Codex*, pref. p. 18, acknowledges "that the external administration of spiritual discipline and of all ecclesiastical matters, in established courts, and established forms, is by authority from the Crown and in subordination to the royal supremacy." This, he imagines, "takes off the reproach on the one hand of her affecting an independence;" as, on the other hand, the divine rights conveyed in orders to that of being "a mere creature of the State." Other Anglican writers, when they have proved

the recognition by the State of spiritual powers existing in the reformed bishops, imagine they have proved what is sufficient for the Church's "independent existence" in Mr. Wilberforce's sense; whereas the very purpose of Henry and Elizabeth was to have a real hierarchy, nominated, confirmed, maintained in action, corrected, *ruled* in short, by themselves. They coveted only the power which the Pope had held, of being *head*; they did not wish to destroy or impair the body, but to derive intact that continual directive power and influence, and to exert that control, which constitute supremacy. A wise monarch does not impair the several powers of his subordinate magistrates, but he takes care that their dependence on himself be unquestionable; and so the Tudor sovereigns carefully maintained the spiritual powers of their bishops, only making them entirely subordinate to themselves in the acquisition, maintenance, and exercise of those powers. Now, in one word, this is a supremacy of jurisdiction, and it includes spiritual mission as one of its parts. Nor can any words be more express and distinct than those of the acts of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, which ascribe this whole supremacy of jurisdiction to the temporal monarch. Still more convincing is this language when they not only declare that ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the temporal monarch, but that the Papal authority, which consists in that very jurisdiction, "robs the king of his honour, right, and pre-eminence" (28 Henry VIII. Gibson's *Codex*, p. 25). Thus the act 37 Henry VIII. cap. 17, declares, "Whereas the royal majesty is justly supreme head in earth of the Church of England, and hath full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies, schisms, errors, vices, and to exercise all other manner of jurisdictions commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdictions." It is added that "the archbishops and bishops have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical but by, under, and from the royal majesty" (Gibson, p. 44). See also 1 Edward VI. c. 2: "All authority of jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, is derived and deduced from the king's majesty as supreme head of these churches and realms of England and Ireland, and so justly acknowledged by the clergy of the said realms; so that all courts ecclesiastical within the said two realms be kept by no other power or authority, either foreign or within the realm, but by the authority of his most excellent majesty" (Gibson, p. 926). The body of ecclesiastical laws called "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*" may at least be quoted, though never absolutely law, as a complete exhibition of the mind of those who wrought the change in religion; and it states, as Mr. Wilberforce remembers, that,

“the king has, and can exercise, the fullest jurisdiction, both civil and ecclesiastical, as well over archbishops and bishops, clergy and other ministers, as over laws, within his own realms and dominions.” It is moreover stated in some of these acts, that he has this power “by God’s law,” and that every monarch has the same in his own realm, which is at least consistent. Mary’s reign having swept away this new spiritual supremacy, the 1st Eliz. c. i. brought it back. The 10th sect. renews the laws of Henry touching the supremacy; reviving eight acts of his, and declaring that the branches, sentences, and words of them shall be deemed and taken to extend to her highness, her heirs, and successors, as fully and largely as ever the precedents did extend to the late King Henry VIII. (Gibson, p. 43). That the queen claimed exactly the same supremacy as her father and brother, is stated in her injunctions (Gibson, p. 54). “Certainly her majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any authority than that was challenged and lastly used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI.,” though she adds, insidiously and falsely, “which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm.” But her power is in the same act, sect. 17, more expressly defined as the very same which had been exercised by the Pope: that it “please your highness that it may be established and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, *as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used* for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall for ever by authority of this present parliament be ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.” And the 19th sect. imposes an oath on all ecclesiastical persons that, “to my power I shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences and authorities granted or belonging unto the queen’s highness, her heirs, and successors, or ceded and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.” Surely it is hard upon Tudor lawyers and Tudor sovereigns to state after this, “that it is impossible to say how much (in the distribution of authority) was intended to be assigned to the clergy and how much to the Crown, because the partition was neither fixed by law nor explained in theory.”

But these are acts of the State—yes, submitted to and acted upon by the Church, and guarded under threat of excommunication! for the second Canon of 1603 declares, that

"whosoever shall hereafter impeach *any part of the king's regal supremacy* in causes ecclesiastical restored to the Crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked errors." Let it be well observed, that not merely the supremacy, as defined in the 37th article, "the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes," though that is strong enough and plain enough, but the supremacy "by the laws of this realm established" by the very acts of the Tudor princes, is thus guarded and imposed by the Church herself. Hard, again, to say, that the distribution of Church authority "was neither decided by the acts of the Church nor by the arguments of its writers." For let us add the very plain and specific words of one of the greatest (Hooker, vol. iii. p. 543):

"There is required an universal power which reacheth over all, importing supreme authority of government over all courts, all judges, all causes; the operation of which power is as well to strengthen, maintain, and uphold particular jurisdictions, which haply might else be of small effect, as also to remedy that which they are not able to help, and to redress that wherein they at any time do otherwise than they ought to do. This power being sometimes in the Bishop of Rome, who, by simple practices, had drawn it into his hands, was for just considerations, by public consent, annexed unto the king's royal seat and crown. From whence the authors of reformation would translate it into their national assemblies or synods; which synods are the only help which they think lawful to use against such evils in the Church as particular jurisdictions are not sufficient to redress. In which case our laws have provided that the king's supereminent authority and power shall serve, as namely, when the whole ecclesiastical, or the principal persons therein, do need visitation and reformation. When in any part of the Church, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities, are grown, which men in their several jurisdictions either do not or cannot help, *whatsoever any spiritual authority or power*, such as legates from the see of Rome would exercise, *hath done, or might heretofore have done, for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort* (that is to say, without the violation of the law of God, or nature, in the deed done), *as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the king for ever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work, that the thing may be their act, and the king their motion unto it, but by commissioners, few or many, who, having the*

king's letters patent, may, on the virtue thereof, execute the premises, as agents in the right *not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his supereminent power.*"

There is one statement on which Mr. Wilberforce seems to rely a great deal in estimating the amount of authority left to the spirituality at the reformation. He recurs to it again and again, as if it yielded him firm ground at least of principle among all the shifting sands of contrary practice and Erastian precedents. He sets his feet upon it and refuses to move, as if he would say, Though all that I hate and deplore actually prevails; yet it ought not so to be: the Church has been betrayed, the compact with her broken; she is insulted, depressed, but at least not herself a traitress. This stone of the god Terminus is the declaration of the 20th Anglican Article, that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," on which he observes, "nothing can be more distinct than the general statement that all matters of doctrine are to be decided by the Church, by virtue of that divine commission to teach, with which it was invested by Christ our Lord" (p. 13). And referring to the statute of appeals, he says, to the like effect, "though an arbitrary and dangerous power was thus committed to the Crown, there was reason to hope that it would be exercised in conformity with the statements to which the Crown was a party, that the decision of doctrine rested with the spirituality." Now no doubt the statute recited (and last year this clause was again and again quoted by those desirous to make out the most favourable case for the liberty of the Anglican Church), "that when any clause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and shewed by *that part* of the said body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church." But the same statute declared that this spirituality, as *part* of the body politic, "was bounden and owen to bear, *next to God*, a natural and humble obedience to its supreme head and king." As the temporalty was imperfect without its head, so was the spirituality. Just so when it is said, "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," it means, not the body of the Church *without* its head, but *with* it,—the whole Church, head and body both; the spirituality, with its "supreme head," the Crown. To a Catholic these words would have a perfectly distinct and Catholic meaning; they would signify that the Episcopate, with its head and crown, the Pope, hath authority in controversies of faith. To an Anglican they have also a distinct, but a very uncatholic meaning; they signify, the body spiritual, with its

“one supreme head and king,” hath authority in controversies of faith. No doubt archbishops, and bishops, and other Church dignitaries, were meant to be *used* in what Mr. Wilberforce calls “the Episcopate system” set up by Henry and Elizabeth; but the enactive power, the supreme force, was to be given to all that they did, to their canons, to their judgments, by him, or by her, whom they had set up to be their head. But is Mr. Wilberforce aware of the very curious fact, that this much-trusted clause was not at all in the articles as presented to Queen Elizabeth; that Cranmer had confined himself to stating that “the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies,” and that the Tudor mastiff-tigress, with a stroke of her pen, put in the clause on which he rests so much, having a juster as well as a bolder notion of Church authority than the tools she was using, and being fully minded that the Church, with herself for its head, should be just as strong, and have just as great a claim on the conscience, as the Church with the Pope for its head? Her favourite secretary Cecil only expressed the policy of his father and his mistress when he said, that “whatever the Pope had done in the Church, the Queen could do.” And this clause rested in obscurity till it was brought out and built upon by the divines of James and Charles. Hooker, in the passage just quoted, goes, it will be observed, as far as Cecil; for the power which, he says, our laws have fully granted to the king includes that exercised in the Gorham judgment. In truth, it being granted that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, since controversies of faith touch the whole body, that authority will be exercised by the supreme power in the Church, as we have just seen in the case of Queen Victoria, who has determined that the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism is an “open question;” just as, if the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception pass from universal private belief into a dogma of faith, it must be, and can only be, by the judgment of St. Peter’s See.

Now, to sum up the powers which composed this royal spiritual supremacy imposed on the Church at the reformation. We have seen it begun by the statute of appeals calling the realm of England a body politic, containing a temporality and a spirituality under the king’s headship. And so it was a political combination from beginning to end,—just as the present English mind refuses to consider the Catholic hierarchy in any but a political aspect, which it calls Papal aggression,—and the supremacy, thus inaugurated, had, when completed, a singular correspondence in its two parts, as it affected the temporality and the spirituality. In both it was

thoroughly political; in both it was legislative, executive, and judicial. Legislative, for as the crown convokes Parliament, and by its assent makes their votes to be laws, so it gives the archbishop license for convocations or synods to meet, as well as adds the enactive force to their canons, without which they are void of coercive power. And the old power of issuing proclamations seems more than paralleled by the imposition of an entirely new prayer-book on the spirituality without their concurrence, up to the canons of 1603. It is executive, for as the crown nominates civil officers, and conducts the machinery of ordinary government through them, so it not only nominates bishops for election, but orders an office to confirm them when elected, that is, to give them spiritual mission; and should the proper officer refuse, it may nominate others, his inferiors, to do the work over his head. Let Archdeacon Wilberforce well consider this provision of the law, for it is decisive as to the source of spiritual mission. Nor does it matter that not a single Anglican archbishop has had courage to refuse consecration to the crown's presentee during three hundred years, however objectionable as to faith or as to morals, so that the provision has never been acted on. It is judicial, for as all temporal courts of justice act by the crown's authority, so the spiritual courts are courts of the bishops, who are crown officers, while supreme judgment in the last resort belongs to the crown, now in a court of privy councillors, formerly in a court of delegates, deriving jurisdiction from it. The only difficulty in estimating the nature and extent of this supremacy arises from the dull, gross, and political manner in which it grasps spiritual powers; such, for instance, as that of jurisdiction, which is theologically divided into external, *in foro exteriori*, and internal, *in foro interiori*; whereas the state in its eagerness after the former, seems to have cared little what became of the latter, as it only dealt with souls and consciences, and sin and the condition of men before God, while external jurisdiction belonged to the Church as the great visible empire of God upon earth, having its own most stately majesty and most orderly arrangement, its outward unity and universal citizenship, which even a Henry and an Elizabeth could appreciate. This, in the fulness of their flesh, they saw, and lusted for, and ravaged; but that, in the utter leanness of their souls, perhaps they left to their underlings, perhaps they thought not of at all.

Now, supposing the Elizabethan episcopacy to have possessed all those sacred powers which are given by consecration, and in order, and so are indelible, yet the power of spiritual mission is not one of these, even according to Archdea-

con Wilberforce's own shewing, and it is absolutely necessary for the *valid* exercise of some of these powers of order, and for the *legitimate* exercise of all; for instance, without it a validly ordained bishop cannot forgive sins, for he has no subjects. Why is it that no Anglican will look this question of the source of spiritual jurisdiction in the face? Why will no one tell us how Bishops Barlow and Scory, Hogskin and Coverdale, could give Dr. Parker spiritual mission to the see of Canterbury, or who did give it him but Queen Elizabeth, and how she had it to give? It is surely not honourable or conscientious to refuse to meet that one point on which, supposing them to be true bishops, the legitimacy of the whole Anglican, American, Scotch, and Colonial episcopate rests. We earnestly press this matter on the notice of Archdeacon Wilberforce. If he will enter with his characteristic honesty into this question of spiritual jurisdiction, we are sure, with his keen appreciation of the Church's constitution, as a divine system of belief and practice, a spiritual empire, that the doubtfulness which now appears to linger on him will vanish: the bride of Christ will appear to him in her matchless beauty.

The sovereign in England, then, was bent on taking the Pope's place over the spirituality, and he took it in spite of all absurdities and anomalies; he mounted the chariot of the sun: what wonder that the earth is dried up and parched and in full conflagration! What wonder that the hearts of Anglican Churchmen are fainting for fear, looking for vital warmth and kindness, and finding death instead! In spiritual matters, around them is a desolate wilderness, and all faces gather blackness. They have no one to look to. Their bishops are a proverb of reproach in their mouths, of cowardice and unmanliness. Their wisest and most thoughtful divines fret away their heart in the solitude of their parishes, unable to defend, yet fearing to condemn. If ever an army was in rout, they are routed. Not a banner is raised to the rescue. Not a watchword goes through the ranks. O misery of miseries! To them the Church of Christ is a kingdom divided against itself; to them the city of light is eclipsed in darkness; to them the dove, the undefiled one, lies in a nest of dark heresies; to them the body of Christ has its members tearing each other to pieces. Oh, pray for all hearts tender and true, that they be delivered from this hideous temptation to infidelity, and enter into the kingdom of truth, of light, and of peace!

We turn from this question raised by Archdeacon Wilberforce, observing only further that cruelly as he may be pained at the present state of things, shocked as every Catholic principle within him must be, he cannot, as we think

we have proved, assure himself, or defend his communion, on the ground that the "Episcopal system" set up at the Reformation has been infringed as to the primary terms of its compact. The crown is no more supreme now than it was then. It is the distinctive work of the reformation which he reprehends, not a corruption and perversion of that work. The glorious doctrine of the Word made flesh has borne his spirit aloft into a purer region; he has once gazed upon the fountain of light; he longs for its warmth, and is clothed and suffocated among the fogs of Anglicanism.

For where in the Thirty-nine Articles, or in the range of Anglican Church literature—for theology there is none—will he find the following view of the Church? "The Christian faith was originally proclaimed *as the germinant principle of a society*; and it cannot be otherwise than important that it should be perpetuated among ourselves under conditions not inconsistent with its original constitution and organic laws" (p. 1). "Thus did the intuitive conceptions of the Christian mind become fixed in authoritative expressions. The results of private thought and individual reverence acquired a form and shape, when they were embodied in dogmatic words by those who had authority to enjoin them. As the moral instincts of nature assume a new character when common consent has stamped them with the authority of laws, so that instinctive feeling with which Christians regarded the mysteries of the unseen world was matured by the Church's judgment into the Catholic faith" (p. 136). "His guiding grace, the living principle of his mystic body, which had first dwelt in fulness in his Apostles as a gift of inspiration, was understood to dwell as a gift of interpretation in the collective episcopate. This was a point on which the ancient Church was as well qualified to give evidence, as any other on which its verdict is accepted. Do we accept its judgment that the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Revelation of St. John should be admitted into the sacred Canon; and can we deny the verdict which it had previously pronounced, that the most sacred doctrines were to be understood according to that view of truth into which the Holy Ghost guided its collective Fathers?" (p. 134.) "The Church's authority does not interfere with the observations of sense or the inferences of reason; its province is that spiritual intuition which pronounces upon doctrines. And its witness is as conclusive in declaring the faith, as that of logic in explaining our ideas, or that of sense in communicating phenomena" (p. 139). "Natural intuition must be exercised in subordination to the testimony of humanity; spiritual to the testimony of the Church. The first has its origin

in that plastic power which appoints our nature; the second in that pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost, by which the whole body of Christ is animated. Rationalism, then, is that system of opinion which puts the first of these principles in place of the second. It does not positively reject religion, or disown Scripture, but recognises no higher criterion than the judgment of mankind and the principles of nature. It supposes that the mass of men are competent in themselves to arrive at truth, because, through the multiplicity of opinions, opposite errors will eliminate one another. And therefore it either denies inspiration altogether, or denies at least that principle of divine guidance, which is the necessary correlative of inspiration. In the first case it supposes the contents of Scripture to be discoverable by natural reason; in the second it supposes the canon of Scripture to be fixed by feeling or criticism; not by that guiding Spirit which directs the Church. Thus does Rationalism dethrone and destroy that presiding principle which unites the body of Christ into one organic whole. For Church authority has been shewn to be no arbitrary rule, but the result of that indwelling grace whereby the religious intuitions of individuals are matured into the Catholic faith" (p. 141).

It would seem that Archdeacon Wilberforce has deeply entered into what is called the doctrine of development. The principles here set forth are a real support and comfort to the Catholic, to whom the first, and the nineteenth, and every intervening or future century, must be bound together in one intimate union; who realises in his every-day worship the blessed truth of the Church's infallible guidance; but what must they be to one who is required to believe and avow that, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith:" and that "General Councils, when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and word of God), may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God" (19th and 21st Articles).

But if Mr. Wilberforce underrates greatly in our judgment the original evil done at the reformation to the independence of the Anglican Church's spiritual existence, at least he is far from blind to the misery of her present condition. Let it be remembered that the following statements are wrung, we doubt not with anguish of heart, from that one of all her actual sons who has most distinguished himself in the study of dogmatic truth, a dignitary withal, and the bro-

ther of a bishop, and the bearer of a venerable name. It is no enemy, but a child, high in position, higher in ability, who thus pronounces on questions which he knows will touch the heart, and perhaps influence the conduct of many.

"It was reserved for the year 1850 to see the Territorial system, or pure Erastianism, display itself in its full dimensions, and effect its full evils in England" (p. 77). And Erastianism is "the absorption of the Church by the civil government, the resolution of Christ's kingdom into a function of the state. In Erastianism the institutions of the old swallow up those of the new creation, and nature triumphs over grace" (p. 71). "To prescribe that none shall be appointed to the office of bishop, except by the sovereign, is to affirm the principle of Erastianism; it is to usurp the spiritual functions of the Church of Christ" (p. 74). "Such is the theory of the Church of England as exhibited in her laws; but such is *not* the practice, as illustrated by her actions. It would be difficult to find a more glaring contrast than between the prosperity of her apparent state, and the misery of her real situation. She claims to be the depository of a divine truth, which she has a super-human commission to deliver; but the worldly power has in reality taken possession of her frame, and gives expression to its will through her organs of utterance." (This fact, which we see before our eyes, is the most exact and complete carrying out of Henry VIIIth's original idea, as first set forth in the statute of appeals, and illustrated in so many succeeding acts.) "She claims to be the salt of the earth, and she is in reality trodden under foot of men. This is the result of causes long in progress; but its consummation was the transference of the right of deciding respecting doctrine from spiritual to civil rulers; from those who possess authority in Christ's spiritual kingdom, to those whom God's providence has invested with natural power." (Which, again, was done in 1534, and not in 1850.) "No question of doctrine, however fundamental, can at present come into discussion in any court of the Church of England, in which the civil power would not finally interpret, explain, and define the will of God, and require the Church's officers to give effect to its interpretations." (And this, it must be added, would have been equally done by the court of delegates, nominated by the Crown, and deriving their jurisdiction from the Crown, not *necessarily* ecclesiastics from the beginning, nor *actually* so from the restoration; though not this, but the *source* of their jurisdiction is the real point at issue.) "And since the legislative powers of the Church are held in abeyance by penal statutes, its whole action is concentrated in that judicial department, of

which it has been thus despoiled" (p. 145). For, as he elsewhere quotes Hoadly, "Whosoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them;" from Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 673.

The abstract injustice of all this is undoubted; but then it is the original pact; it is at this price that the Establishment has bought its civil status. What the Archdeacon has now discovered, Catholic writers from the commencement of the schism have not ceased to point out. For instance, Suarez, in the reign of James I., wrote a great volume against Anglicanism, which we recommend very heartily to Archdeacon Wilberforce's notice. Now he will find (vol. xxi. lib. 3, c. 7, p. 130,) that Suarez makes the particular Anglican error to consist, not in *denying* that there is a spiritual jurisdiction *in foro exteriori* for the Church's government, but in *annexing* it to the supreme temporal jurisdiction; the very point which he is now deploring as a new thing. "The mysteries of religion only, and the divine laws of the kingdom of Christ, are referred to those who do not possess the qualifications needed to decide them. And observe the effect of this intrusion upon sacred functions. It interferes with that law which has been shewn to be a fundamental principle of the Church of Christ. It takes, as the ultimate judge in questions of doctrine, a human in place of a divine authority. The properties of the individual mind remain as they were before; but when we ask for that guiding principle by which the intentions of individuals are combined and directed, instead of a power which claims divine, we find one which claims human origin. Now this was shewn to be the fundamental principle of Rationalism. For Rationalism likewise is the substitution of nature, as the final criterion, instead of grace." Here, again, Suarez has anticipated the author, for he told James I. that such was the basis of his religious establishment; and the British Solon, not being able to burn his person, burnt his book. "Like Erastianism, it supposes that the impressions of men are to be moulded together merely by a natural rule; and that earthly wisdom and authority is a competent judge in matters of faith. Hence the fantastic reveries of the speculative German. Among our own countrymen, more inclined to political combinations than philosophic theories, the same tendency assumes a practical shape. They claim to dispense with that historical system which conveys to us the Church's judgment, because they have a sufficient criterion of truth and falsehood in their national good sense.

The English people is too great to need any help in the settlement of its religion; it is able to elaborate a creed for itself out of those ancient documents, in which it is its will to place confidence. It will no more be dictated to in religion than in politics or in taste; and the people's mind will be reflected by the judgment of its rulers" (p. 147).

Things ought to be true which are concurred in by opposed authorities, for Archdeacon Wilberforce preaches before the University of Oxford on Sunday, May 18, 1851, much to the same effect as F. Newman at the London Oratory in May 1850; and as his words are a most graphic description of that Erastianism, "the base and hateful features of whose real character" (p. 40) we are thankful to our author for exposing to his countrymen, we will terminate with them this notice of a most useful little book.

"We have not to inquire what is the dogma of a collegiate, antiquarian religion, but what, in the words of the prime minister, will give 'general satisfaction;' what is the religion of Britons. May not the freeborn, self-dependent animal mind of the Englishman choose his religion for himself? And have lawyers more to do than to state, as a matter of fact and history, what that religion is, and for three centuries has been? Are we to obtrude the mysteries of an external, of a dogmatic, of a revealed system, on a nation which intimately feels and has established that each individual is to be his own judge of truth and falsehood in matters of the unseen world? How is it possible that the national Church, forsooth, should be allowed to dogmatise on the point which so immediately affects the nation itself? Why, half the country is unbaptised; it is difficult to say, for certain, who are baptised; shall the country unchristianise itself? it has not yet advanced to indifference on such a matter. Shall it, by a suicidal act, use its own Church against itself, as its instrument to cut itself off from the hope of another life? Shall it confine the Christian promises within limits, and put restrictions upon grace, when it has thrown open trade, removed disabilities, abolished monopolies, taken off agricultural protection, and enlarged the franchise? . . . The giant ocean has suddenly swelled and heaved, and majestically yet masterfully snaps the cables of the small craft which lie upon its bosom, and strands them upon the beach. Hooker, Taylor, Bull, Pearson, Barrow, Tillotson, Warburton, and Horne, names mighty in their generation, are broken and wrecked before the power of a nation's will. One vessel alone can ride those waves,—the boat of Peter, the ark of God."

DR. ACHILLI AND THE INQUISITION.

Dealings with the Inquisition; or, Papal Rome, her Priests and her Jesuits: with important Disclosures. By the Rev. Giacinto Achilli, D.D. London, Arthur Hall; Virtue and Co. 1851.

Dell' Introduzione del Protestantismo in Italia; o sia la Chiesa Cattolica difesa colle Testimonianze de' Protestanti. Per Agostino Theiner, Sacerdote dell' Oratorio. [*On the Introduction of Protestantism into Italy; or the Catholic Church defended by the Testimonies of Protestants.* By Augustin Theiner, Priest of the Oratory. Naples and Rome, 1851.]

WE do not know which most to admire in the book that stands first at the head of our present article, its folly or its effrontery; its folly, considered only with reference to its own manifest absurdities, self-contradictions, falsehoods, and impossibilities; or its effrontery, considered with reference to the circumstances under which it makes its appearance before the tribunal of public opinion in this country. It will be in the recollection of our readers that certain events, professing to be passages from the life of the author of this work, were published to the world about a twelvemonth ago; first in the pages of a Quarterly Review, and then independently as a separate publication; and that in this publication crimes of the most revolting character were laid to the charge of the individual in question, not in any vague and doubtful manner, or in merely general terms, but with the utmost positiveness, and with a distinct enumeration of times and places and persons, and many other circumstances. When, therefore, we take up the present volume, published six or seven months after these charges had been publicly preferred against the author, and find that, in the course of a long autobiography occupying nearly 500 pages, no mention is made of them, or rather that they *are* mentioned (or at least very distinctly alluded to), and yet that no attempt is made to refute them, we are certainly lost in astonishment; we can only conclude that the author feels the task of vindication to be either impossible or unnecessary; and, of course, it may be unnecessary, either because he has already fallen, and fallen hopelessly, from the high position which he once occupied in the

(so-called) Evangelical world; or because his canonisation is complete, and not a word that may now be said can be allowed to throw any doubt on the validity of the decree by which it was effected. For ourselves, we are not sufficiently familiar with the calendar of Exeter Hall to be able to say which of these alternatives represents the true state of the case; but judging from the character of the work before us, we should say it must needs be one or the other. Certainly these "dealings with the Inquisition" do *not* seem to be the work of a man conscious that he is *upon his trial*. And yet we should have thought that he could not but feel himself to be in that position; and moreover, the very publication of this autobiography in *any* shape, under the circumstances, would seem tantamount to an acknowledgment that such was his real position. If so, it is clear that he entertains but the very meanest opinion both of the learning and the judgment of those who have to pronounce his sentence, otherwise he could not possibly have ventured to set before them such manifest falsehoods as are contained in the present work. A few of these falsehoods we think it worth while to expose, though we are happy to be able to assure our readers, that in so doing we shall have no occasion to repeat any of those disgusting matters to which we have thus briefly alluded. If Achilli himself is contented that such imputations should lie upon his character, it is not for us to object; we shall go on therefore to examine this new work of his by the ordinary rules of criticism, without any reference to the very unusual circumstances under which it is brought before the public.

First, then, we must warn our readers that the contents of the work by no means correspond to the title; in fact, the title is a mere clap-trap to ensnare unwary purchasers; Dr. Achilli's "dealings with the Inquisition" form but a very insignificant portion of the book to which he has chosen to affix this name, considerably less than a tithe of the whole; the rest is taken up with an account of "my creed, my conversion, my exile, my mission, my Italian Church, my farewell to Rome, my views of Naples and the Neapolitans, &c., &c.;" all very well in their way, no doubt, but not half so attractive as a true and faithful account of Dr. Achilli's dealings with the Inquisition, or rather of the Inquisition's dealings with Dr. Achilli, would have been. Former narratives of his life had given us to understand that he was twice a prisoner of the Inquisition, and the same thing is told us in the present volume. Now it is no common sight in the nineteenth century to see a man who has ever had any thing at all to do with that awe-inspiring tribunal; what shall we say then of a man who has

actually been twice imprisoned in its dungeons? Surely such a man must have an almost infinite store of really authentic information, that would be most interesting and valuable to the Protestant public; and surely this is the volume in which we should expect to find it. "Dealings with the Inquisition; or Papal Rome, her priests and Jesuits: *with important disclosures*, by Dr. Achilli." What more can be desired? "This will be the text-book," we said to ourselves when first we took the volume in hand,—“this will be the text-book for all Protestant controversialists and declaimers at Exeter Hall and other places throughout the kingdom during the next twenty years upon the subject of this tribunal, already so great an object of abhorrence to our fellow-countrymen; we must read it therefore very carefully, diligently sift all its statements, and publish the result of our inquiries, that so Catholics may be provided with the necessary armour of defence against weapons that are sure to be drawn from this well-stocked arsenal.” Such was our feeling when first we sat down to read the book; but when we found ourselves at the end of the volume, and came to look at the notes which we had made of all that concerned the Inquisition, what was our surprise to find that it amounted to *vox et præterea nihil*, the title and nothing else. Of his own dealings with the Inquisition there is literally nothing, beyond the fact already mentioned that he was imprisoned by it twice; and even of this we have the most meagre barren notice that can possibly be conceived. We are told that he “had occasion to leave Naples on account of some important business which called him to Rome in the year 1841” (p. 358), that is, in plainer English, and according to the biography furnished in the publication we have before alluded to, he was expelled from Naples by order of the police on the 2d of February in that year, and he went to Rome; by and by, when he was “on the point of leaving Rome to return to Naples, he was arrested by an invisible enemy, and that enemy was the Inquisition.” Here the reader’s curiosity is naturally raised to the highest pitch of expectation; there is something in the selection and arrangement of the words calculated to increase this feeling; now at last he flatters himself that he is going to have some of those “important disclosures” that were promised him in the title-page, and that tempted him perhaps to procure the book; now he will hear all about the thumb-screws, the rack, and all the other instruments of torture; now he will gain a real insight into the most hidden secrets of that terrible prison-house. But, alas, all his expectations are most cruelly disappointed; after five pages of vague assertions about the part which was taken by some

of "those wretched monks of Naples," first in "chanting their hymn of victory" over his apprehension, and then in getting up "various documents relating to his cause," we are landed at the end of the chapter without a single syllable of information as to the charge upon which he had been arrested, the way in which his arrest was effected by this invisible enemy, the manner of conducting his trial, the hardships and cruelties he endured during his imprisonment, the way in which he was ultimately released, nor, in fact, any one particular worth mentioning, which can fairly be called his "dealings with the Inquisition." We are told that "those who at that juncture sought to oppress and calumniate me, have come to shame and confusion;" and then we are hastily transported to another scene: "It was in the month of September 1842, that I found myself beyond the walls of Rome, in the province of Sabina, in a fine country near Nazzano" (p. 364). To fill up this *hiatus* between the arrest in Rome in 1841 at the end of chapter xii., and this sojourn "in a fine country near Nazzano" in the autumn of 1842, at the beginning of chapter xiii., our author supplies literally nothing: perhaps he thought that there was no necessity for adding to the very distinct information upon this head which had been already given by the writer in the *Dublin Review*, viz. that when arraigned before the Inquisition, both for his false doctrine and gross immoralities, he confessed his guilt and submitted to any punishment that might be imposed; in consideration of which submission he received the very lenient sentence of banishment for three years to the remote and secluded convent of his order in that "fine country near Nazzano." Perhaps, we say, he thought his readers would be satisfied with this account of the matter; at any rate, he has not chosen to supply them with any other, and we can only conclude therefore, either that he acknowledges the truth of this, or that the truth being really something worse, he wisely adopts the homely maxim of "the least said, soonest mended."

But it is not only on the subject of the Inquisition that this author's performance is so unequal to his promises; it is a general characteristic of the whole book; from first to last, the reader is perpetually tantalised by having the most tempting subjects of information just set before him, so as to awaken his appetite, and then suddenly withdrawn from him.

The second chapter professes to give us some account "of the subjects treated upon in this narrative;" and certainly never was a bill of fare set before a hungry guest more utterly at variance with the viands actually supplied to him, than is this chapter of promises when compared with the sub-

sequent performance of them. It would be quite an endless task to enumerate *all* the questions which he has here proposed, and to which he has promised an answer, but which, in fact, never occur again in any part of the work. Some of these questions being of a somewhat dry and abstract nature, the breach of promise may escape the notice of many readers, or if noticed at all, may be accounted a subject of congratulation rather than of complaint; there are others, on the other hand, which are precisely those points of interest upon which, our curiosity having once been raised, we desire the fullest information; and here the omission can scarcely fail to have been noticed even by the most careless, and resented even by the meekest of readers. Thus, he promises to “detail *accurately* the transactions of the French with regard to himself, that no future historian may deceive the world by a false account” (p. 27). Yet when it comes to the proper place to redeem this promise, we are told that “the *capitaine rapporteur* said certain things to me which I forbear to mention, as well as some other things of little import to any one but myself, for fear of causing trouble to parties still remaining in Rome” (p. 484); in fact, he merely tells us what every one knew before, that he escaped “through the assistance of the French Government;” but how this assistance was rendered, what motives induced them to render it, who was the principal agent in the transaction, and every other interesting particular (which is what we understand by *accurate details*, and some of which had been specifically mentioned and promised), is left in the same obscurity as before, and future historians may still deceive the world by a false account, spite of Achilli’s solemn assurances to the contrary. Then, again, there are two circumstances upon which we are more especially told that the author will “dwell *at large*, under the impression that those persons for whom he chiefly writes will be greatly interested in a *minute account of all that took place on those occasions*. I refer,” he says, “to my examination before the Judge of the Inquisition, and my conference with the Theologian of the same establishment, who was sent to endeavour by his arguments to bring me back to the Church of Rome” (p. 27). And presently we are again assured that (p. 28) “the conferences between the Theologian of the Romish Church and myself will occupy an important portion of this work.” Here, surely, is a most distinct engagement on the part of the author to tell us *every thing* about these conferences; he expressly says that he is anxious, “not only that all that passed between us may be known, but that the manner of it may also be understood” (p. 28). And how is this engagement fulfilled? The whole

space allotted to the "minute account" of both these circumstances, both the examination and the conferences, does not exceed nine pages; so that what was promised to be "an important portion of the work" proves to be less than a hundredth part of it; and even this scanty fragment consists for the most part of the merest commonplaces and vague generalities, and, moreover, as we shall presently see, is utterly and entirely false.

So much, then, concerning the way in which the author of this work fulfils his own promises, and concerning those things which he ought to have told us, but has not. Let us next look at the character of what he really *has* told us. We have said that it is full of falsehoods, self-contradictions, and absurdities; and it will not be difficult to prove the accuracy of our charge. As a specimen of falsehood and self-contradiction, compare the two versions of the same story that are given us in chapters v. and xiv. The two passages stand as follows: in page 107 we read,

"It is notorious that in Constantinople, in the year 1847, an Armenian priest, Don Giovanni Keosse, although an Ottoman subject and born in Constantinople, was seized in the night by four bullies from the Austrian embassy, and hurried into a steamer, to be conveyed as a prisoner to Marseilles, and thence to Rome, to be handed over to the Inquisition. And all this took place by order of the Armenian Catholic Bishop. This Keosse, who was confined in a cabin on board the steamer, found means to effect his escape, by slipping through the window into a boat, while the vessel was disembarking a part of its passengers and goods at Smyrna. He subsequently put himself under the protection of the American Consul; and the Austrian, finding himself discovered, gave up the affair, and so it ended. Keosse, however, did not feel at all sure of his safety from the grasp of the Inquisition so long as he remained under the Ottoman Government; and being advised to go to Malta, he went there without delay, and there he remains at the present period."

So far, so good; here is at least a perfectly intelligible story, and one which will commend itself to all good Protestants that read it, as very natural and probable: a poor innocent unoffending priest, seized in the night by the emissaries of the Inquisition and hurried on board a steamer, and all this by order of the Catholic Bishop; and then the persecuted individual making his escape and flying for safety to the British flag in the Island of Malta: this is as it should be; every body in the story fills his proper place and appears in his appropriate character. But now let us turn to p. 390, and lo, in what different colours do we find the same scene painted!

Achilli is enumerating his coadjutors in the Protestant Theological College at Malta, and he says :

“A fifth came from Smyrna, an Armenian priest named Giovanni Keosse, who stated that he had escaped through the assistance of a Bishop, and under the protection of the Austrian ambassador, from the clutches of the Roman Inquisition, which had laid hold of him at Constantinople . . . He came in a furtive sort of manner, and the reports I received concerning him were by no means to his advantage, so that I began to suspect some evil design on his part, and in fact he soon shewed himself in his proper colours . . . he then thought fit to throw off the mask ; he was an agent of the opposite party. . . . This Keosse, after having accomplished his mission . . . turned Protestantism into derision, and elated the Jesuits with their victory, now turned his back on the Malta Protestant College, and repaired to Rome to receive the reward of his labours ; doubtless he will be made a bishop.”

We beg our readers to mark well the discrepancies between these two passages, for indeed they are of no ordinary kind ; we certainly never remember to have seen two versions of the same story told in the same book by the same writer more utterly at variance with one another. First, as to the authority on which the story rests : in the one case we are told that it is a matter of public notoriety ; in the other, that it was Keosse's own statement ; but it is insinuated that Keosse was not a man whose statements could be trusted. Then, as to the story itself : in the one case, he is seized by order of the Armenian Catholic Bishop, and immediately by the servants of the Austrian embassy, and he effects his escape by means of his own cleverness, by slipping through a cabin-window into a boat ; in the other, it is precisely under the protection of the Austrian Ambassador, and through the assistance of a bishop, that he makes his escape from the clutches of the Inquisition. In the one case, he is the *victim* of this merciless tribunal ; in the other, he is its *agent*. In the one case, not feeling sure of his safety from the grasp of the Inquisition, he goes to Malta, “*and there he remains at the present period ;*” in the other, he “turns his back on the Malta Protestant College, and repairs to Rome to receive”—what ? perpetual imprisonment in the dungeons of the Inquisition ? Nothing of the kind ; but on the contrary, “the reward of his labours ; doubtless he will be made a bishop.” Can any thing be more patent than this self-contradiction ? And yet the writer has the boldness to declare that he is actuated solely by a love of truth in coming before the public at all : “My sole motive,” he says (p. 18), “has been to make the truth evident, that all

may apprehend it. It was for hearing and speaking the truth, that I incurred the hatred of the Papal court. It was for the truth's sake, that I hesitated at no sacrifice it required from me; and it is for the truth that I lay the present narrative before the public;" "falsehood is no longer a venial offence, it is a serious crime, the motto of the present age is liberty and truth." After the specimen we have given of our author's performances under this head, we think our readers will agree with us, that at any rate truth is *not* the motto of Dr. Achilli. For ourselves, we have read the book with some attention, and we doubt whether there is any one fact from beginning to end which is truly stated; in most cases, the falsehood is ludicrously palpable even to the most ordinary observation. And yet we see among the "opinions of the press" paraded in the advertisement of a second edition, that one journal has declared it to be "*an authority* on all that relates to the Inquisition;" another says that it is "worthy of our attention," and then adds (but with modest caution), "and we believe also, worthy of our trust;" whilst a third—and that too no mean hireling, whose praises are to be bought, but a really independent and on ordinary matters a very able authority, does not scruple to say, "this book contains internal evidence of truth." "Internal evidence of *truth*!" had he said "of falsehood," we could have understood him; but "truth" is really too ridiculous. A nice internal evidence of truth is that we have just pointed out. Here is another, taken from his account of a conversation, or rather a series of conversations, which he held with a Jesuit father at Tivoli, in the year 1833; and the reader must bear in mind that this Jesuit is represented as having just taken the solemn vows, and been admitted to the last profession. Achilli asks his friend, why the Jesuits are never raised to places of dignity or profit in the Church; to which the *wily* Jesuit is made to answer, "If any other person than yourself had put this question to me, I should have given him the answer which our institution puts into our mouths. A Jesuit is sworn to aspire to no ecclesiastical dignity, nor can he accept any, without a special dispensation from the Pope. But this reply will not be sufficient for you, to whom I have disclosed so many of our secrets. I tell you then—" But we are sure our readers will not care to hear the wretched mixture of nonsense and wickedness which is here made to follow from this extremely communicative member of the Society of Jesus. Suffice it to say, that this same individual confides to Dr. Achilli that the Jesuits are the authors of Puseyism in England, that they are exceedingly busy in stirring up strife among the Dissenters;

and, in short, that he reveals the whole secret history of their doings both in this country and elsewhere.

There is one especial characteristic, however, of this conversation with the Jesuit which is worth mentioning, more particularly since it is afterwards repeated in other conversations also, viz. the speaker is endowed with the gift of prophecy; and lest any of his predictions should be lost upon the reader, a note is always appended, calling his attention both to the prophecy and to its fulfilment; *e.g.* in p. 171, "This prophecy has come to pass;" in p. 172, "Here likewise the Jesuit has proved himself a true prophet;" in p. 178, "The Jesuit was again correct in his prediction." As to the subject-matter of these prophecies, they take a somewhat extended range, from the straight-cut coat and upright collar of the Puseyite parson, and the preference given by that eccentric section of the English Episcopalians to Popery rather than Dissent, up to the violent expulsion of the Jesuits and the flight of the Pope during the recent disturbances at Rome. Is any one disposed to doubt their authenticity? You have Dr. Achilli's word for it, who now, in the year 1851, has just published to the world the full and complete account of this conversation held in the autumn of the year 1833, *precisely* at the very moment, be it remembered, when the publication of the *Tracts for the Times* was begun in Oxford. Truly this wonderful Jesuit had the gift of second sight in no mean degree; for in describing the actual condition of English Episcopalians at that time (the autumn of 1833), he says: "The clergy of the Reformed Church of the present day, both ministers and *bishops* (!), have for the most part an idea that the Reformation has taken away much which might have been retained. . . . And thus by degrees in some churches *we see* images set up over the communion-table, which give it the appearance of an altar. And if an image is not allowed, at least a handsome cross may be painted and gilded, before which the minister as he passes may make his obeisance" (p. 172). We recommend Dr. Achilli to study the *variations* of Puseyism a little more closely, before he ventures to make them the subject of another imaginary conversation held some fifteen or twenty years back; especially let him thoroughly master its chronology, or at least let him submit the ms. of his conversations and prophecies, on all that concerns England, to some English friend who may correct such glaring errors as these.

One more *prophecy*, and we have done. It was in the year 1835 that a certain Roman priest, "a very respectable man named Father Parchetti," was conversing with our friend

on the subject of Papal Rome, which he very wisely observed would "never die by her own hand, and will make every possible struggle against any other that may be lifted up to give her her death-stroke." It scarcely required a prophet, even one of Achilli's manufacture, to tell us this. However, he goes on to say, that "Rome is committing the greatest blunders every day, and that the day will come when she will make a last and fatal one. Can you guess what it will be?" "Certainly not," is the modest and prudent answer of Achilli; "but I should like to hear it from you"—and so, we dare say, would our readers also. Here it is then, slightly abridged, as the limits of our space require; but nevertheless ushered in with all the solemnity so justly recorded in the original, and befitting the announcement of so great an event.

"Listen then, and remember it," said the oracle, "because I shall not live to see it, but you may. Mark what I foretell. The missionaries of the Propaganda will instigate Rome to commit some act of imprudence. What I foresee is this: the influence of Rome in the British Isles must produce its effect, which is that of converting the Protestants to our faith. If to the English and Irish missionaries which Rome has hitherto employed, those of Italy, and more especially the Jesuits, are united, proselytes cannot fail. In fact, they will be so numerous, and will excite so much interest, that Rome will be led to imagine that the time has arrived for her to take England by assault. Accordingly the Pope will create Bishops and Archbishops, declaring the Protestant Hierarchy completely null and abolished. England, not being prepared for this master-stroke of policy, will for the moment be too astonished to testify her sense of its audacity; but soon recollecting her former history, and conscious of her power, she will institute new laws to prevent usurpation, and she will drive away the aggressors, &c. England will do this the very day that Rome gives her sufficient provocation, and that day will be fatal in its results. This, my friend, is what I prophesy; when it comes to pass, recollect what my words have been."

And then our author has the face to append to this veracious history the following reflection:

"These sentiments, delivered by the good old man in the year 1835, now appear as if they had been dictated by inspiration" (p. 278).

Surely this will prove too strong a dose even for the credulity of Exeter Hall: if not,

"Danda est hellebori pars maxima; . . .
Nescio an Anticyram ratio illis destinet omnem."

Enough has now been said to convey to our readers a tolerably correct idea of this last work of Dr. Achilli; they

will see that it is so clumsy and barefaced an attempt to impose upon the ignorant and the credulous, that perhaps it was scarcely necessary for us to take any notice of it at all. And indeed we should hardly have done so, had not Father Theiner's work come to hand, and by revealing to us the simple truth about *some* of Achilli's dealings with the Inquisition, excited in us a curiosity to see his own account, not only of those particular passages with which Father Theiner was concerned, but also of all the others.

Father Theiner is the individual whom Achilli is pleased to call "the Theologian of the Inquisition," "the papal Theologian," "the Theologian of the Romish Church," &c., as if he were some extraordinary public officer belonging to that establishment and occupying some distinguished position in it, whereas he was perfectly well aware that he had no connexion with it whatever. However, a theologian he undoubtedly is, and enjoys a very high reputation both for learning and piety, being one of those distinguished converts whom Germany has of late years given to the true fold. On the 8th of January in the present year, the Cardinal Vicar of Rome addressed to him the following note, which, as it was never intended to meet the public eye, will not be uninteresting, we think, to many of our readers :

"Very Reverend Father,—I have to propose to you to exercise an act of charity towards a poor miserable man, whom if God, by your means, should vouchsafe to recall to his fold, it will be much to the advantage of religion. The unhappy man I speak of is Achilli, whose lamentable history will not be unknown to you, and who is now a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo. Our Holy Father, in his great anxiety for his eternal salvation, has ordered me to appoint some learned and zealous ecclesiastic, who under the pretext of paying him a visit of charity in his prison, may introduce the topic of religion with him, and so make him conscious of his errors, and bring him back to God. I know of no one better suited to carry out this benevolent purpose of his Holiness than yourself, Reverend Father; I beg you therefore to undertake it, with the certainty that, whatever may be its success, you will at least be gaining merit in God's sight. Not doubting but that you will send me a reply in the affirmative, I remain, &c.

C. CARD. VICAR."

In obedience to this invitation, F. Theiner visited Achilli four separate times during the week from the 12th to the 19th of January; and unless the unhappy man was guilty of the most consummate hypocrisy during these interviews, which we will not believe, God's grace was not inactive in his heart, and had well nigh overcome his malice, when the unlooked-for opportunity of escape was offered him, and he was once

more launched on that active course of error and falsehood from which his imprisonment had for a while suspended him. Of course, Achilli himself has given us to understand concerning these interviews, that they were so many opportunities for him "to deliver his testimony" in the presence of the very enemy, and that he never failed to make the most of them as such. He even says that he used to observe to several of his friends who were with him in prison, "I am only afraid that, feeling how firm I am, Padre Theiner may discontinue his visits, and tell the Cardinals and the Pope that every attempt to bring me back to the Roman Church is useless" (p. 482). Whether he really *did* make this lying boast to his fellow-prisoners, we have no means of ascertaining; we believe that he did not: we *know* his account of what he said to F. Theiner to be false. He says, that "at the end of each visit he always requested him to report to the Cardinal Vicar every thing he had said, adding that every day he felt more and more firm and fixed in his purpose." On the contrary, *we* know that, whereas in the first visit he *did* attempt to argue and to maintain that St. Peter had never been made head of the Church, and even had never been in Rome at all; yet at the end of the third he implored his charitable visitor again and again to go as soon as he had left the prison and pray for him at the tomb of St. Peter, that tomb which he now affects to despise, and to have always despised. We know that even in the *second* visit matters had gone so far between the prisoner and his newly-found friend, that their discourse no longer consisted of theological arguments, but concerned the manner of his reconciliation with the Church; and that when this subject was under discussion, there was no disputing (as Achilli would fain have us believe) as to what was meant by this word 'Church,' but that the topic which was uppermost in his mind and upon his lips was this, "If I submit, what will become of me? What will the Pope and Cardinals do to me? How shall I live?" We know that to remove these fears, and give him courage and confidence as to his future fate, Father Theiner promised, on the word of a German, which he told him was as good as an oath, to share the last farthing of his own private means with him; and even, if need were, to appeal for help to the Prussian Embassy, rather than that he should suffer privation and want in consequence of his apostacy. (N.B. The reader must remember that at this time he was not only secularised, and so had no claim for support on the Dominican Order, but that he had also been suspended from the exercise of every sacerdotal function; he could not therefore say Mass, or earn a liveli-

hood in the capacity of chaplain any where. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.*) All this, I say, we know from the narrative of Father Theiner (pp. 248-258), which was published in Rome and Naples nearly a twelvemonth ago, long before Achilli had undertaken the office of making their conference public, which he professes to have done in the present volume with such "great satisfaction."

We need not institute any closer comparison between the two versions, for the substance of both has been already sufficiently declared; the occasion, however, of F. Theiner's publication is too interesting to be omitted, since it reveals to us so touching an example of that deep personal interest which our Holy Father never fails to manifest towards all who are in any way brought in contact with him. We make no apology, therefore, for inserting the following letter, written from Portici, where the Pope was then residing, by Monsignor Luca Pacifici, his Holiness's Secretary for Latin letters: it is addressed to Father Theiner, and bears the date of the 20th of February, 1850.

"Most Reverend and illustrious Sir,—The Holy Father, ever anxious to recal to the right path those who have strayed from it, though he has heard with much concern what has been the result of your zealous exertions in behalf of the unfortunate Achilli, nevertheless would fain make another effort through you to rescue that poor soul from the desperate enterprise in which it is embarked; and he is the more moved to do this, because, as I gather from your last letter, Achilli seemed to be very well disposed towards yourself personally, and to give you grounds of hope. His Holiness would desire therefore that you should write a letter to Achilli, wherever he may now be, full of words of affection, dictated by your own charity and learning, to the end that he may be roused out of that miserable lethargy in which he now lies.

"Should it please the merciful God to bless this further attempt, the good that may be expected to result from it will be a real consolation to his Holiness, and will redound to the glory of our holy Mother the Church. I have no misgivings as to your thorough and hearty accordance with what I have written; his Holiness gives you his blessing with all his heart; and I remain," &c. &c.

On the receipt of this letter, F. Theiner immediately proposed to himself to carry out an idea which he had already communicated to Achilli in one of his conferences, and indeed had partially adopted, viz. to compile a sort of Apology for the Catholic Church out of the concessions of its most determined adversaries, wisely judging that it was not possible to do justice to so large a subject as the defence of the Catholic faith within the limits of a single letter. The Pope, as soon

as he had heard of F. Theiner's proposition, not only sanctioned and encouraged it, but commanded him to put it into execution with all possible speed, and promised to undertake the expenses of publication, if they could not otherwise be provided for. Out of these circumstances grew the present work, in which, if there is not much room for the display of originality and talent, there is at least a necessity for great industry and research. It was not written as an exercise of the intellect, or for the display of learning, but solely as a labour of love for the conversion of a poor wandering sinner; and as such it deserves a high rank among the rapidly increasing volumes of popular Catholic controversial literature.

Its argument is something of this kind: Protestantism is no longer a new system, whose professions deserve to be examined upon their own merits, and to be compared with the testimony of the Bible and of the Church; it is now three centuries old, and during this period it has had plenty of time to come to maturity, and we see its fruits. We need not then, in order to ascertain its true character, enter into any minute examination of its creeds and principles, and definitions and articles of faith, as they appear on paper, but may take a shorter and surer way of dealing with it by looking at its results. And what are these? We do not ask what they are in the opinions of Catholics and of the enemies of the Reformation, but what are they even according to the confession of the most zealous and learned Protestants themselves? Starting from this principle, F. Theiner goes on to shew, from the writings of the most eminent German Protestants, that the Reformation has produced in that country an almost complete and avowed abandonment of Christianity itself, even in its vaguest and most general acceptation; and during this first part of his work, his line of argument is precisely that which was very ably followed in an article of the *Dublin Review* some four or five years ago, intituled "Developments of Protestantism."

But our author, not content with this merely destructive argument for the annihilation of Protestantism, proceeds in the second part to construct a positive and a very forcible argument in favour of the doctrines of Catholicism from the very same sources. He brings together a number of passages, selected from the writings of the most eminent German Protestants of the present century, in defence of various doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, against which their forefathers so vehemently protested. And certainly it is a strange and striking spectacle to see the descendants of Luther, and Calvin, and Melancthon, in the very country which was the

cradle of the Reformation, striving to stem the tide of public opinion in the course on which those men were the first to set it, and bearing most unequivocal testimony to those blessed truths which those men were the first to deny. There is scarcely a distinctive doctrine of the Catholic Church for which we do not find in these pages some warm and eloquent apology from the pen of one who was brought up to disbelieve it, perhaps even trained and educated expressly to resist and calumniate it. Here the insufficiency of holy Scripture, as the only rule of faith, is as loudly proclaimed as if the writer had been a Catholic and not a Protestant; and even the rejection of the (so-called) Apocryphal Books is made the subject of complaint, as an unwarranted innovation; the indiscriminate reading of the Bible is declared to be a serious evil, and the Bible Societies are condemned as eminently mischievous; the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist is justified as right and according to truth; the necessity for a visible centre of union to the Christian Church is inculcated, and the beneficial effects of the Papacy, both on the cause of European civilisation and of the Christian religion, frankly acknowledged; the sacrament of penance is restored to its proper place in the Christian system, and the necessity of auricular confession positively insisted on; invocation of the saints, and a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin, is recognised with approbation; so also are purgatory, and prayer for the dead; monasticism, and the whole discipline of the cloistered life, is praised with the utmost enthusiasm; and, finally, even the rites and ceremonies of Catholic worship are made the subject of frequent panegyric. Wonderful phenomenon! to see the whole fabric of Catholic discipline and doctrine built up by men whose very calling it would seem to have been to pull it down and destroy it. Yet it is a phenomenon which we have witnessed in our own country also, not only of late years in the writings of those Puseyites who have ultimately submitted to the Church, and so deprived their former testimony to its truth and sublimity of all that rhetorical power which belongs to the acknowledgment of an avowed enemy, but also in the writings of past generations who died, as they had lived, out of the true fold. In fact, many an Anglican has, by God's grace, been moved to become a Catholic through an attentive consideration of this phenomenon; he studies the Anglican divines, and he finds that in becoming a Catholic he is but "embracing that creed which alone is the scope to which they converge in their separate teaching; the creed which upholds the divinity of tradition with Laud, consent of Fathers with Beveridge, a visible Church with

Bramhall, a tribunal of dogmatic decisions with Bull, the authority of the Pope with Thorndike, penance with Taylor, prayers for the dead with Ussher, celibacy, asceticism, ecclesiastical discipline with Bingham."* It is curious, therefore,—and to those who are separated from us it ought to be very instructive,—to observe how the same phenomena are every where produced in Protestantism, even under the most different external and political circumstances,—first, divisions and subdivisions within itself, tending with irresistible force to decay and utter dissolution; and then yearnings, more or less loudly expressed, but always most keenly felt by the wisest and best of its victims, towards a return to the ancient truth.

We have no space to make extracts, and indeed what we see before our eyes renders such a task altogether unnecessary; the religious history of our own country during the last twenty years is as apt an illustration as can be desired of this second part of F. Theiner's work; in fact, the English theological literature of that period might be made to supply a precise parallel to what he has here collected from the theological literature of Germany; but such a collection would be more curious perhaps than useful, excepting for the particular purpose for which it has been here undertaken, viz. to prevent a people who are happily as yet strangers to Protestantism from ever entering upon that road, in which all travellers seem, sooner or later, to desire nothing so much as to retrace their steps. Should any of our readers, however, have any desire to pursue the investigation of this subject more closely, it may be worth while to mention that, besides the volume now before us, it is also very fully treated of in a German work published in 1837 by Dr. Höninghaus, and translated into French in 1845. The title of the French translation is, *La réforme contre la réforme, ou retour à l'unité catholique par la voie du Protestantisme*, and it was published with an introduction by M. Audin.

The third part of Father Theiner's work is principally taken up with a review of the present actual condition of public opinion on religious matters generally, of all parties external to the Catholic Church, in Germany; and it contains some very interesting details on the religious condition of the Jews in that country. The spirit of Rationalism seems to have made the same desolating inroad on the religious belief of the Jews, as it has on that of the Protestants; "there is now no Hebrew community, or synagogue, however small," says one of themselves (Dr. Creizenach, quoted by F. Theiner, p. 219), "which is not divided into two sections, the orthodox,

* Loss and Gain, p. 325.

and the reformers, those who reverence the Talmud and those who reject it; those who observe all the ritual laws most strictly, and those who call themselves enlightened and liberal men, and who therefore reject nearly all the ancient legal and religious ceremonies, on the plea that they were merely accidental to the system, not essential, and quite out of keeping with the spirit of the age." Even the belief in a future Messiah has given way before this "liberal and enlightened" spirit; or rather it has been designedly discouraged, and as far as possible eradicated out of the minds of the poorer part of the population, because it was found to expose them too much to the artifices of every designing impostor who chose to assume that character. Modern Judaism, then, is as unlike the Judaism of Moses and Aaron, and David and the Prophets, as the Christianity of Protestantism is unlike the Christianity of St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom and St. Gregory. Both the one and the other have drifted away from their ancient moorings, and are now at the mercy of every wind and wave which they may chance to come across on that wild waste of waters on which they have entered. And from this deadly infection of Rationalism, which is spreading so rapidly on every side, individuals are being rescued, both from among Protestants and from among Jews, here one and there another, and being gathered into the one true fold, *extra quam nulla salus*. In Germany as in England, "Rome and unbelief are the two vortices round which, and into which, all other modes of opinion are visibly edging, in more or less quickening circles;" and we quite agree with Father Theiner in drawing from this fact a most encouraging omen as to the rich harvest of souls which we may expect to see gathered into the Church, even during the present generation.

In conclusion, Father Theiner makes a powerful appeal to the Italians, more especially the Romans, to stand firm in the faith in which they have been brought up, and to resist the impious and sacrilegious attempts which are being made by a few miserable apostates, traitors alike to their country and to their faith, to introduce the hateful poison of Protestantism,—that is, in truth, of infidelity and atheism,—into that favoured peninsula; he reminds them of the obligations which they owe to those who have occupied the See of Peter, and not least to their present sovereign, Pius IX., some of whose most striking and valuable allocutions and encyclical letters he has added in an Appendix; and then he gives us that history of his conferences with Achilli of which we have already spoken, and which were the occasion, as we have seen, of the

whole work being written at all. That it should effect the end for which its amiable author was persuaded to undertake it, is more than we can dare hope for. Achilli surrounded with his wife and friends and all the comforts of an English home, paraded about on the platform, fêted at Exeter Hall and Evangelical tea-meetings, is a very different individual from Achilli left to his own reflections in the solitude of a Roman prison; it is not his understanding that needs enlightenment, but his will and affections that require correction; his attachment to Protestantism springs from the same source, and deserves the same treatment, as Aristotle would award to those children who cannot see that it is their duty to obey their parents; οὐ λόγου δεονται, ἀλλὰ κολασεως, says the Stagyrte; and we are very much of his opinion. At the same time, we would not have it supposed that we mean to characterise F. Theiner's work as useless on this account, and merely so much lost labour. Far from it; the deceived are always more numerous than the deceivers, and deserve much more consideration; and should there be any, either in Rome or in any other part of Italy, who were really led astray in matters of faith by means of Dr. Achilli and his friends (we believe that religion was the last subject about which Achilli himself ever troubled those who frequented him, whether *in* prison or out of it), this book may by God's grace be expected to do good service in the way of opening their eyes to the folly of which they have been guilty; we say the *folly*, because (as our readers will have seen from the sketch which we have given of the general contents of the work) this is the point which F. Theiner's demonstrations go to prove, the folly of Italians taking up Protestantism at a time when everywhere else it has been tried and failed, and is now being universally abandoned, some exchanging it for the ancient and Catholic faith, others for pantheism and infidelity. "Luther built up a Church," said one of his disciples more than thirty years ago, at the *tercentenary* celebration of that heretic's memory, "and we are come together to-day to bless and to praise God for it; but behold, at the very moment that we are doing so, already it has ceased to exist" (Reinhard apud Theiner, p. 80). If this confession was necessary thirty years since, what shall we say now? Certainly the last thirty years have witnessed, in this country at least, a more rapid progress in the decay of Protestantism than twice that number of years in any earlier period of its existence; and its recent violent but futile attempts to withstand the aggression of its ancient enemy, are already producing results that must inevitably hasten its dissolution.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE extreme depression in the bookselling trade, consequent on the Exhibition in Hyde Park, is shared by the Catholic publishers, who suffer at the same time from the present exasperation of the Protestant public against every thing that is called Catholic. We have but few novelties, therefore, to recommend this month.

Dr. Rock has brought out a new edition of his *Hierurgia* (Dolman) in a single volume, with a few additions. Considering the apathy of so many Catholics towards Catholic literature, it is satisfactory to see a book of so much learning and merit reaching a new edition. The more learned reader need not be informed that the *Hierurgia* is indispensable to the English Catholic library.

Dr. Crookall, to whose exertions is due the present admirable ecclesiastical chanting at St. Edmund's College, has added two more numbers to his series of *Sacred Songs*, &c. (Burns and Lambert): containing *Lauda Jerusalem*, a pleasing, simple, and lively composition for four voices; Zingarelli's *O sacrum Convivium*, a somewhat flimsy production, for three voices; and a motett by the editor, *Iustorum animæ*, quite as easy as Zingarelli's commonplaces, and a vast deal better as a composition.

The *Clifton Tracts*, as far as they have now appeared, have been issued in a volume. This is a good thought of the editors, as it puts them in a much more *lendable* shape.

If new books are less multitudinous than usual, the catalogue of older ones is innumerable, as we are reminded by the sight of another of Mr. Stewart's Catalogues, just out. Here is one bookseller offering above 2000 different works on *Ecclesiastical and Monastic History and Antiquities* (chiefly Catholic) as a mere portion of his collection. Few booksellers, it is true, can compete with Mr. Stewart in his own peculiar line.

We observe with great pleasure that M. de Rossi has read before the Archæological Academy in Rome a very brief programme of his long-promised work on the *Ancient Christian Inscriptions* of that city. It appears that his collection, confined to the first six centuries as to time, and to the metropolis of Christendom as to place, will comprise upwards of 8000 inscriptions; and that of these more than half have been copied by himself from the original monuments. These 8000 inscriptions will be distributed in three classes: the first, of all those which throw any light upon the dogmas, discipline, or rites and ceremonies of the Church in those early days; the second, of those which are of any value as elucidating points of philology, geography, civil and domestic manners, and the like; and the rest will be arranged chronologically in the third class. The

arrangement within the first and second classes will be not merely chronological, but also of such a nature as that the inscriptions shall mutually explain one another by the juxtaposition of all that belong to kindred subjects.

This programme was received by the Pontifical Academy with the warmest applause; and the appearance of the first portion of the work is looked for with great eagerness by all the *savans* assembled in Rome. It will be an invaluable work both to the student of profane and of Christian archæology.

Correspondence.

ON THE DISPOSAL OF THE SECOND ABLUTION IN CASE OF DUPLICATION.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Your correspondent "S." will find the subject of his query discussed at some length in Mr. Hughes's book on the Ceremonies of Low Mass, p. 90 of the edition of 1846.

In the first case proposed, namely, that of the second Mass being said in the same church, there can be no doubt that the rules laid down for the Masses on Christmas-day should be followed. At the first Mass, the chalice should not be purified (*S. R. C.* 16 Sept. 1702, n. 3486; *Gardellini*, 16 Sept. 1815, n. 4365), but should be covered with the paten and pall, and left upon the corporal (*Merati*, part iv. tit. 3, n. 7; *Janssens*, part iii. tit. 9, n. 17; *Romsée*, tom. iii. art. 2, n. 13). The purificator should not be used to wipe the chalice or the celebrant's mouth, and it should not be placed upon the chalice (*Directorium ad usum Eccl. Mechliniensis pro Die Nat. Dni.*). The celebrant should then wash his fingers at the Epistle corner in *aliquo vase mundo*, both wine and water being poured over them for that purpose as usual (*Merati*, *ibid.*; *Directorium Mechl.* *ibid.*). Having wiped his fingers with the purificator, he should place the above-mentioned vessel at the back part of the altar, cover it with a pall, and place the purificator near to it (*Merati*, *ibid.*; *Romsée*, *ibid.*). He should then cover the chalice with the veil. If it be necessary to remove the chalice from the altar to the sacristy before the second Mass, it should always be placed upon a corporal or pall (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 8 and 14). It appears from the decree 16th September, 1815, that it may be placed within the tabernacle. At the second Mass, the celebrant should not wipe the chalice with the purificator at the offertory, and he should not remove it from the corporal (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 9 and 14; *Romsée*, *ibid.*). After the communion of the second Mass, the celebrant, having received the ordinary purification, should pour the ablution of the first Mass from the aforesaid vessel into the chalice, receive it, then wash his fingers over the chalice as usual, and afterwards wipe both the chalice and the vessel with the purificator (*Merati*, *ibid.* n. 10).

In the second case, namely, when the second Mass is said in another church, all should be done as above, except that the veil of the chalice should be fastened securely about it in the same way as done on Maundy

Thursday (*S. R. C.* 16th September, 1815, n. 4365); and this same chalice should be taken and used for the second Mass. The words of the above decree are: "Emi Domini Cardinales S. Rit. Congregationi præpositi reprobarunt usum duorum calicum tamquam in Ecclesia novum, et censuerunt unum dumtaxat esse adhibendum ut in more est apud Missionarias in locis præsertim infidelium." This decree makes no mention of what is to be done with the ablution of the fingers in this second case. Mr. Hughes (*Cerem. of Low Mass*, p. 93) inclines to the opinion that it should be poured into the sacrarium. The *Encyclopédie* of the Abbé Migne, tom. xv. art. "Binage," observes that "l'ablution des doigts présente moins de difficulté puisqu'on peut la mettre dans la piscine." Bauldry (part iv. cap. 2, n. 24) and the *Manuel des Cérémonies Rom.* (tom. ii. part 6, art. 3, n. 5,) direct that the ablutions of the first and second Mass of Christmas-day be poured into the sacrarium, provided the priest be prevented from receiving them at the third Mass. There are, however, some who approve of the practice of carrying the ablutions to the second Mass. L.

August 6th, 1851.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—With regard to the disposal of the second ablution in the case of duplicating, I beg to submit whether, as the practice of duplicating is wholly exceptional, and as the Church has consequently made no provision for it, we ought not to form our rule in the matter upon that which is given for the three Masses on Christmas-day? It is there prescribed (vid. *Ordo*) that the second ablution shall be made with *wine and water*, as usual. And I do not see what inconvenience follows from purifying the fingers with wine and water, not, however, over the chalice, but in a separate vessel (*in aliquo vase mundo*—vid. *Ordo*), and receiving this ablution, as on Christmas-day, with that of the last Mass. I am aware, however, that there is authority in practice for the plan of your correspondent, viz. the purification of the fingers in water alone, and making it in the vessel used at communions out of Mass.

While, however, I submit these observations, I beg to express a strong opinion that such questions are more appropriately made the subject of a reference to authority, or of consultation at clerical conferences, than of discussion in a periodical which has a wide circulation among Protestants as well as Catholics.

I am, sir, your faithful servant,

F.

PATRON AND TITULAR SAINTS.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—I avail myself with pleasure of your Portfolio, that I may ask whether I am right in the ideas that I have formed regarding Patron and Titular Saints. I assert my positions as if they were certain, simply for convenience' sake. I speak entirely under correction; and my object in writing is, that I may have my ideas either confirmed or disproved.

First, then, I believe the word "Titular" or *Titulus* belongs solely to what is commonly called the "Patron" of a church. It is a useful word, as including mysteries, such as the Transfiguration or the Immaculate Conception, which are the titles of some churches. The term "Patron" is properly applied to the *Santo avvocato of places* rather than

churches. Thus a place may be under the invocation of some one patron, and in it there may be several churches with various titles. The title of a church is a feast of the rite of double of the first class with an octave, having also a commemoration in the suffrages, in its due place, to the clergy attached to that particular church, and to them only. The Bishop of the diocese has the power of assigning a title to a church, even to one that is not consecrated; and the clergy are bound in such a case by the Bishop's act. But, on the other hand, no one but the Pope can assign a patron to a particular locality, unless the Saint has been *elected* patron, according to the regulations of Pope Urban VIII., given, I believe, in some editions of the Breviary. In this latter case, besides the rite *dupl. 1 cl. cum Oct.*, and the commemoration in the suffrages, the feast becomes a day of obligation in the locality, and its vigil a fast-day. Such would also be the consequence of the Pope's granting a local patron, unless an exception to this rule should be expressly mentioned in the rescript. Further, there can be one patron of a nation, another of a province, another of a diocese, and another of a town; all of which will have to be observed with the same honours by all living within the particular localities. When more patrons than one have thus to be kept, they take their place in the suffrages according to their rank; and when of equal rank, the particular is preferred to the more general. Thus a Martyr precedes a Confessor, a Bishop precedes one who was not a Bishop; and when of equal rank, the titular of the church precedes the patron of the diocese, and the diocese again is preferred to the province or nation. And to conclude this general view of the subject, in the *A cunctis* the titular of the church in which the Mass is said is alone mentioned, and not any other patron whatever.

Now, to look to our own case in England, what patrons have we? It is said that Pope Benedict XIV. made St. George patron of the *nation*, and I have heard 1746 given as the date of the brief; but I am unable to find it in that great Pope's Bullarium. Can any of your readers direct me to a copy of it? However, the *fact* seems undeniable that St. George is patron of all England, and the *law* equally clear that all England is bound to honour him with all the rights of a patron; and he is not interfered with, nor his rights diminished, by any more local or particular patronage. With regard to patrons of dioceses, I presume that the establishment of the Hierarchy has annulled all previous patronages conceded. We have, then, to look only to those granted since our present organisation. The archdiocese and the diocese of Southwark are under the patronage of Our Lady in her Immaculate Conception; the diocese of Northampton is under St. Thomas of Canterbury: I am not aware of any other. In the former case, I should be glad to ask how the patron is to be commemorated in the suffrages; whether *Sancta Maria* is sufficient, or whether it has to come from the new office of the Immaculate Conception. In the case of Northampton, St. Thomas precedes St. George, the antiphons and verses being taken according to the rule given by the S. R. C.

I wish to ask in conclusion, by what right the compiler of the *Ordo* calls St. Thomas *Cleri Sac. Angliæ Protect.* What Pope made him so? And what consequences does it entail? And finally, whether the patrons of a nation and of a diocese are to be honoured as such by the regulars therein, as well by those who live in community as by those who have cure of souls? Are there any decrees on the subject?

Yours, &c.

J. M.

P.S. The *Credo* ought to be said on the secondary feasts of patrons and titulars, as on their translations, &c.

In answer to the queries of "John Morris" in our July number the pastor of one of the chief cathedral parishes in the United States writes as follows:

I am pleased to see a new leaf opened in the *Rambler*, to be appropriated to the proposing and answering of questions by the clergy. If I thought it were not too late, I would answer the questions thus;—though American notions about theology might not have much weight.

1st. These questions are too indefinite.

2d. By no right, unless this privilege has been granted by Rome. Those who say the office on that day do not satisfy the obligation.

3d. The same as is used when persons who are confined by sickness receive communion in their houses.

4th. It has no authority, except it has derived some special privilege from Rome, as is the case with the ritual used in America.

5th. It is the custom for the servers to kneel in the Propaganda.

6th. The countersignature and seal are not sufficient.

7th. Yes. The priest says the whole of both, and this is sufficient.

At some future time, it is not unlikely that some questions for solution will be sent from this side of the Atlantic.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—Will you be so good as to insert the following questions in the Priest's Portfolio in your next Number?

1. Can we ask the souls in Purgatory to pray for us?

2. Can Indulgences obtained by a person for the dead be placed in the hands of our Blessed Lady, begging of her to apply them to whom she will?

Yours faithfully,

F. M. A.

Ecclesiastical Register.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ASSUMPTION ACT: ITS AUTHORS.

THIS bill received the royal assent on the 1st August. It is the joint production of her Majesty's Ministers, Mr. Walpole, Sir Frederic Thesiger, and Mr. Keogh. The part which belongs to her Majesty's Ministers is printed in Roman letter, the rest is in Italic.

Whereas divers of her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects have assumed to themselves the titles of Archbishops and Bishops of a pretended province, and of pretended sees or dioceses, within the United Kingdom, under colour of an alleged authority given to them for that purpose *by certain Briefs, Rescripts, or Letters Apostolical from the See of Rome, and particularly—*[Sir F. Thesiger's]—*by a certain Brief, Rescript, or Letter Apostolical purporting to have been given at Rome on the 29th September, 1850; and whereas, by the act of the tenth year of King George the Fourth, chapter seven, after reciting that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, and likewise the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, were by the respective acts of Union of England and Scotland, and of Great Britain and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably, and that the right and title of Archbishops to their respective provinces, of Bishops to their sees, and of Deans to their*

deaneries, as well in England as in Ireland, had been settled and established by law, it was enacted, that if any person after the commencement of that act, other than the person thereunto authorised by law, should assume or use the name, style, or title of Archbishop of any province, Bishop of any bishopric, or Dean of any deanery in England or Ireland, he should for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of 100*l*.—[Mr. Walpole's]—And whereas it may be doubted whether the recited enactment extends to the assumption of the title of Archbishop or Bishop of a pretended province or diocese, or Archbishop or Bishop of a city, place, or territory, or Dean of any pretended deanery in England or Ireland, not being the see, province, or diocese of any Archbishop or Bishop, or deanery of any Dean, recognised by law; but the attempt to establish, under colour of authority from the See of Rome or otherwise, such pretended sees, provinces, dioceses, or deaneries, is illegal and void: and, whereas it is expedient to prohibit the assumption of such titles in respect of any places within the United Kingdom: Be it therefore declared and enacted, by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that,

1. *All such Briefs, Rescripts, or Letters Apostolical, and all and every the jurisdiction, authority, pre-eminence, or title conferred, or pretended to be conferred thereby, are and shall be deemed unlawful and void*.—[Mr. Walpole's].

2. And be it enacted, that if, after the passing of this act, any person shall obtain, or cause to be procured, from the Bishop or See of Rome, or shall publish or put in use, within any part of the United Kingdom, any such Bull, Brief, Rescript, or Letters Apostolical, or any other instrument or writing for the purpose of constituting such Archbishops or Bishops of such pretended provinces, sees, or dioceses within the United Kingdom, or if any person—[Sir F. Thesiger's]—other than a person thereunto authorised by law in respect of an archbishopric, bishopric, or deanery of the United Church of England and Ireland, assume or use the name, style, or title of Archbishop, Bishop, Dean of any city, town, or place, or of any territory or district (under any designation or description whatsoever) in the United Kingdom, whether such city, town, or place, or such territory or district, be or be not the see or the province, or coextensive with the province, of any Archbishop, or the see or the diocese, or coextensive with the diocese, of any Bishop, or the seat or place of the church of any Dean, or coextensive with any deanery of the said United Church; the person so offending shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of 100*l*., to be recovered as penalties imposed by the recited act may be recovered under the provisions thereof, or by action of debt at the suit of any person in one of her Majesty's superior courts of law, with the consent of her Majesty's Attorney-General in England and Ireland, or her Majesty's Advocate in Scotland, as the case may be—[Sir F. Thesiger's].

3. This act shall not extend or apply to the assumption or use by any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland exercising episcopal functions within some district or place in Scotland, of any name, style, or title in respect of such district or place; but nothing herein contained shall be taken to give any right to any such Bishop to assume or use any name, style, or title which he is not now by law entitled to assume or use.

4. *Be it enacted, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to annul, repeal, or in any manner affect any provision contained in an act passed in the eighth year of the reign of her present Majesty, intituled "An Act for the more effectual application of Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland"*.—[Mr. Keogh's].

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER 1851.

PART XLVI.

STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

IN considering the era of the Reformation, the period between the reigns of Henry III. and Henry VIII., it is of the utmost importance to recapitulate the result of our review of the period which preceded that era.

We have seen that originally, as the office and function of a pastor, whether a priest or bishop, were purely spiritual, so the conferring of the pastoral office, priestly or episcopal, was considered likewise of purely spiritual cognizance. And so much was this considered, that even after bishoprics and parishes were endowed, and the Church was "established," for some centuries the Crown was conceived to have no concern whatever with appointments to the episcopate or the priesthood, nor any concern whatever with the exercise of the episcopal or priestly functions. The parties, whether monarchs or private individuals, who endowed the "churches," episcopal or parochial, drove no bargain with the Church, did not consider that they thereby *purchased* any thing, did not seek to acquire a control over the spiritual as an equivalent for their donations of the temporal; in other words, did not, as the price of their endowments of parishes, require the right of "presentation" to them, and thus turn a "cure" of souls into a "living," and make it a matter of barter. But on this very account, we have seen, in the purer and primitive age of the Anglican Church, *because* the princes and the people were such good children of the Church that they did not desire to *buy* a right of intermeddling in her spiritual governance, but deemed it an honour and a privilege to lay their worldly possessions at her feet, and considered the appointment to the episcopate or parochial pastorship a purely spiritual matter; and because they partook in a great measure of the spirit of

primitive piety,—the Church placed confidence in them, and a custom arose of consulting the pious laity, whether of kingly or of noble rank, as to the appointments to vacant bishoprics or cures. In process of time, however, we have seen, even in the Anglo-Saxon age, the spirit of worldliness rose in the Church, and men, both clerical and lay, began to think more of the *temporalities* of a bishopric or a cure than of the *spiritualities*; and instead of considering the latter as the principal, and the former merely as the accidents and accessories, looked upon the appointment to the bishopric or cure more as the means of becoming possessed of the temporal goods belonging to it; and to speak, therefore, of the *temporalities* of the see instead of the episcopate as the “bishopric,” and to call a cure of souls a “benefice;” and as a natural consequence of this evil in the Church, counteracted as it was in the Anglo-Saxon age by the saintliness of so many of its sovereigns, but aggravated as it was under the Norman dynasty by the utter worldliness and wickedness of the monarchs who reigned, we find bishoprics and benefices avowedly conferred, under the pretence of “nomination” or “presentation,” by the Crown or the lay patron. It will have been observed, however, that this system, as it had probably originally arisen, so existed, or at least succeeded to a greater extent, in the cases of *benefices* or *bishoprics* than of *archbishoprics*; the reason being, that whereas the former were, except in cases of appeal, settled in this country by the confirmation or induction of the archbishop or bishop, in the case of an archbishop the Papal confirmation and the conferring of the pall was requisite to confer full archiepiscopal authority. And the effect of this was, of course, to bring archiepiscopal elections more promptly and regularly under the consideration and control of the Pontiff, the Supreme Pastor of the Church; and the consequence was, as we have seen, that in such cases it was that most frequently, and indeed constantly, occurred collisions between the Holy See and the Crown, and disallowance of archiepiscopal elections as uncanonical or corrupt. Indirectly, of course, the occurrence of these contests in cases of archbishops kept constantly before the courts and the national Church the authority of the Holy See, as an appeal in all similar cases of corrupt or uncanonical elections or inductions in regard to bishoprics or benefices. And it can easily be conceived that all this was exceedingly inconvenient and annoying to the Crown and the corrupt portion of the clergy and laity, being a continual check on their sordid patronagemongering. Nevertheless, the Pontifical authority was too clear ever to be denied, however its exercise in particular

cases might be disputed or obstructed. It may have been observed, however, that the mode in which the Holy See had hitherto exercised its control over archiepiscopal or episcopal elections was about as inconvenient to the Church as the existence of the authority was to the Crown, inasmuch as it necessarily entailed an interval often of one, two, or three years, during which the see was kept vacant, while one or more corrupt and uncanonical elections were being set aside; and (as we have seen) the Pontiff sometimes had, in order to prevent longer delay, to terminate the dispute *by himself appointing to the vacant see*;—an exercise of supreme pastoral power which, however often exclaimed against, was never denied or defied, but in every instance implicitly admitted, the prelate so appointed always being revered and recognised as such. This tended to stifle that sordid spirit which had begun to eat into the core of the English Church, and led too many of her laity and clergy to regard the appointment to sees and cures of souls chiefly or exclusively as a *legal* right to their *temporal* possessions, by acting upon the principle that the matter was one of purely *pastoral* authority. But the Pope at last found that the only way of completely overcoming the local system of corruption which bought and sold bishoprics and benefices, and under the pretence of *patronage* drove a dirty barter in the cure of souls, was to *anticipate the exercise* of this “patronage,” and so stifle the system in its rise, by exercising his paramount pastoral power, not only so far as absolutely to appoint to bishoprics or parishes himself when *vacant*, but to make appointments by way of “provision” for vacancies. We have seen that the Papal appointments were as usually *good* as those of the Crown or lay patrons were usually or generally bad; and it is obvious that what the Supreme Pastor might do when he pleased, he might as well *do at once*, and *prevent* the evil rather than remedy it. But we have seen that a jealousy had arisen on the part of the laity and clergy of the English Church as to the exercise of this power, purely on account of its tending to confer temporalities on foreigners, or at all events to supersede local “rights” of patronage, and the sordid jobbing which had become *incident* to it. Thus, then, a spirit of resistance to the Holy See in this matter had arisen, solely from the sordid spirit of worldliness and the foul love of money, for those who complained did not (as we have seen) at all pretend that the Pope’s appointments were not *good*; and (as we have also seen) the local ones were often *bad*, and the complainants themselves put their objections upon merely mean and *money* grounds. Such was the state of things at the end of the reign

of Henry III., and such an abuse we see still more plainly and painfully in the reigns of his successors, precisely the same spirit actuating all of them, and the successive parliaments under them, up to the fatal consummation of all in the reign of Henry VIII.

At the end of the reign of Henry III. we first find (as we have shewn) a spirit of resistance to the right of the Pope to appoint absolutely to any bishopric or benefice; and we have seen that this arose simply on account of the bishoprics and benefices having come to be considered chiefly or solely as temporal, and not as spiritual; whereas the constant exercise of this supreme pastoral power of the Pope inconveniently interfered with this theory, and proceeded upon the contrary idea that they were purely spiritual. The whole question depended upon this: Which was the principal and the paramount, the spiritual or the temporal? Was the spiritual, by having temporalities belonging to it, made temporal or *quasi* temporal; and must it, therefore, be subservient and subordinate to the temporal? In short, must the cure of souls be considered the chief thing, or its *endowment*? The Crown had long said the latter, and now the people, clergy, and laity began to say so too. But the common law* and common sense said the contrary; for the cure of souls was prior and was principal; the endowment was subsequent and accessory, and so should be subservient; and if the original donors of the endowment did not (as we have seen) stipulate for any right of control over the spiritual, or of nomination or presentation to the cure of souls, what right had their successors to claim what their ancestors had never stipulated for? And that they had *never* so stipulated, nor supposed they had *purchased* rights of patronage or presentation, is clear from what we have seen in history, and from many things we can shew in law. Thus, as we have mentioned, the *Mirror of Justice*, the oldest book of our common law, says not a word of any such rights and patronage either in the Crown or any private parties. And in the reign of Edward III. a curious case occurs, in which one of the judges says (speaking of a transaction which took place under the Conqueror), "*it is not long since a man knew not what an advowson was,*" i. e. a legal right of presentation. Clearly, then, any such claim was unknown *before* the Conquest, and was *recent* some considerable time *after* it. Another fact we have already stated (especially as to the charters) seems to shew conclusively that the claim was an usurpation of the Norman monarchs, arising from their

* As laid down by Bracton in this very reign. See the citations in the *Catholic Hierarchy considered*.

enormous rapacity. Lastly, that great sage of the law, Bracton, writing in this very reign of Henry III., speaks of this claim of patronage as purely temporal, and as only pertaining to the temporal, and as accessory and secondary to the spiritual, which, he lays down distinctly, it must not interfere with or contest, but must have full freedom, according to the law of the Church; so that though the Crown had power to withhold the temporalities, the Pope had sovereign power to confer the spiritualities, *i. e.* the pastoral jurisdiction, parochial or episcopal.

Such having been the state of things and such the state of the law at the end of the reign of Henry III., we proceed to the very eventful reign of Edward I. We have explained that in order to counteract the sordid system of corruption under which, as we have seen, a shameful traffic was sure almost to take place upon the vacation of a bishopric or benefice between the clergy and the Crown, or other lay patrons, the Holy Father had found it necessary sometimes to *appoint himself* absolutely upon vacancies, and *provisionally* for *future* vacancies; *i. e.* in the latter case the Pope appointed persons to sees or cures of souls before they were vacant, by anticipation or provision, and in order to preclude the possibility of a corrupt exercise of the "right" of patronage, which, be it carefully observed, was *no right* at all, but simply an *usurpation*. The Pope's mode of *evading* the usurpation, and superseding the sordid system it was made subservient to, of course caused jealousy and discontent; and an outcry at last arose against it, which, as we have already hinted, was equally popular and plausible, for it was at once *natural* and *national*: it was natural that the English clergy, who, if local patrons could exercise their right or claim, would secure benefices or bishoprics, should complain of losing them; and it was *national* that the Crown and other lay patrons, who on this subject had a perfect sympathy, should object to temporal property being virtually given away *by* foreigners, and often *to* foreigners. But though the feeling was *natural* and *national*, it was neither logical nor legal; for the temporal possessions were the *accident* and *accessory* to the cure of souls, and must necessarily follow and attend the principal; and (as already stated) the law considered that the *temporal followed the spiritual*, and that over the spiritual the Pope was supreme. Selfishness, however, cares not for logic, and will *warp* law if it can; and the Crown and people of England soon *warped* the law to their own purpose, and made a law of their own to cripple and restrain the Papal power of presentation, and *really* to resist the spiritual authority, while professedly only resisting the *temporal results* of its exercise.

For, let it be remarked that the Pope never claimed to confer the temporalities.* All *he* ever claimed to appoint to was the pastorship, episcopal or parochial; the Crown or lay patrons *presented* the temporal possessions attached thereto, and the law of England compelled them to present them to those who were so appointed by the Pope to the pastorship, deeming the temporal *incident* to the spiritual, and the Pope *supreme over the spiritual*. And *being* supreme, the law has hitherto heard or known nothing about restraining the exercise of this power by restricting it to sees or cures already vacant or otherwise. Such a restraint could scarcely be logical, rational, or consistent; because, as the Pope had power to remove a bishop or priest by virtue of his sovereign supremacy, and then appoint some one in his stead, it could hardly be objected to that he should provide for a vacancy when it should occur, and which he could create when he chose. Moreover, it is worth while to observe, that the first provision was by St. Peter; who, as Rufinus states, when he ordained St. Clement to the see of Rome, ordained Linus, or Editus, as his successor, to provide "against a vacancy." And it may be added, that (as in our first article we shewed) in the earliest ages of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the Pope in appointing to the archiepiscopal sees also made provision as to a successor. So clear is it that the Pope had a right to make these provisions, and that they did not at all interfere with any right of the Crown, that we find from Lingard that the Crown itself resorted to them; and so well was it understood that they did not touch any temporal rights, that we read in Rymer that it was customary for the Pope to send a copy of the provision to the king, with a request that he would *grant* the *temporalities* of the see to the new bishop. If the king did not choose to do so, the new prelate of course had no remedy, but was not the less recognised as *bishop* by the law of the land as well as by the law of the Church. It is impossible to prove more plainly that, by both the one law and the other, these provisions were justified and sanctioned. In short, they were a settled and constant custom before the close of the reign of Henry III.,* clearly recognised by the law; insomuch that when a knight who had, "by papal provision, been deprived of his nomination to a *living* in the gift of his family,"† raised a conspiracy against the custom, seizing the persons and goods of the foreign ecclesiastics who were benefited by it, although in *secret*

* Indeed, so little difference was seen in principle between an absolute and provisional appointment, that it should seem sometimes the phrase 'provision' is applied to *any* appointment by the Pope.

† We are pained to say that this is the language of Lingard: a "*living*!"

some chief persons in the realm abetted the opposition, they durst not openly avow it, and the law repressed it; and the restoration of provisions was repeatedly matter of negotiation.

At the same time, it must be mentioned that the jealousy of the English clergy led prelates of considerable distinction to oppose themselves to Papal provisions, without whose opposition probably the Crown and the laity would never have dared to resist them; and it is at once instructive and melancholy to remark, that a bishop so eminent as Grosteste should have openly opposed himself on this point to the Papal supremacy; and that while, with an inconsistency which is observed by Dr. Lingard, he “professed a most profound veneration for the successors of St. Peter, and entertained most exalted ideas of their prerogatives,” yet he “would often *dispute the exercise of their authority*, and neither Pope nor legate could prevail upon him to give institution to *foreign* clergymen presented to benefices in his diocese.” This is the language of Lingard, and it discloses no shadow of excuse for the prelate, who does not dare, it appears, to deny the Papal *right*, nor to put his opposition to its exercise on the ground that *improper persons* were presented, but solely that *foreigners* were presented. From the manner, however, in which the historian narrates in the very next passage an instance in which the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln resisted a Papal provision, one is encouraged to entertain a charitable hope that his opposition was rather of the character of remonstrance as to the particular exercise of the right, than of unqualified resistance to it on the *wretched* ground put forward—apparently with no scruple as to its sufficiency—by the modern Catholic historian of England. “When the nuncio sent him a provision by which the nephew of Innocent IV. was promoted to a prebend in the church of Lincoln, Grosteste replied, in language *singularly energetic*, ‘that *the provision*’ (*i. e.* as it should seem, *this particular provision*) ‘was contrary to the good of the Church; that he would not consider it as emanating from the Pontiff’ (*i. e.* implying, as it may be presumed, that he rather supposed it an *oversight*, and that if it really *did* emanate from the Pontiff, he would be bound to obey it), ‘and that he should never deem it his duty to carry it into execution.’” That the real reason for the bishop’s resistance, at least in this case, and probably in others, was not any inclination to defy or deny the right, but simply to remonstrate as to its *exercise*, we may the more believe (notwithstanding the evident inclination of the historian to make the contrary appear) from the fact, that the Pope was not at all indignant, but wrote an answer *proposing remedies for any abuses in the practice* of provisions.

That abuses sometimes did occur, it were of course not worth while to dispute, though our readers will observe that the Pope was the proper authority to remedy them, and never refused to exert himself for that end; and they will, we think, have been convinced from our previous statements that abuses far more frequently occurred on kingly appointments than papal provisions, which were rather the remedies than the means of abuse. Our ideas on the subject are confirmed by finding that when Grosteste presented to the Pope a memorial on the abuses of the Church, and mentioned first the evil of bad pastors, and complained that the Holy See could remedy this evil, although he added a complaint of provisions, it would rather appear from the context that he meant *such provisions as imposed bad pastors on the Church*, and did not intend to object to the exercise of the right of Papal presentment, or otherwise it would be obviously inconsistent in him to complain of the Holy See for not exercising its power to prevent the intrusion of bad pastors, that is, by *appointing good ones*.

In the reign of Edward I. we find ample confirmation of these views. In the first year of his reign (A.D. 1276), the Pope appointed Robert de Kelwordly to the see of Canterbury. The king's council (the monarch being on his way from the Holy Land) admitted the new primate with a protestation (we quote Lingard), "that the provision* was contrary to the rights of the Crown" (mark the sole consequence), "and that the king would not for the future hold himself obliged to grant the *temporalities* to prelates so provided." Here it is evident the very statesmen who were disposed to dispute papal provisions did so at least *directly* only as to the *temporalities*, and dared not deny that the prelate "provided" was *bishop*. Some years later we read, "the archbishop resigned on being appointed cardinal; and the Pope appointed his successor, but omitted in his letter to the king the usual request concerning temporalities. The omission created an objection; but on the supposition that it had been an error of the clerk, was at length overlooked." In Wharton's *Anglia Sacra* we find it stated that in the same reign (1282) a Bishop of Winchester, after being *admitted by the king*, was set aside by the Pope, who conferred the see on another, and consecrated him at Rome. So, at the close of the same reign (1305), we find that the Pope, without consulting king or chapter, created William de Greynebord Bishop of Winchester, and, probably by an oversight, professed in the bull to confer on him the *temporalities* as well as the *spiritualities*; on which

* Lingard has not stated that appointment was properly by way of provision, i. e. before the death of the predecessor.

the king withheld the temporalities until the bishop renounced that clause in the bull, and confessed that he held the temporalities of the Crown; which renunciation and declaration were from that time exacted from every prelate presented by papal provision; and the *very exaction implied that thereby all legal objection to papal provisions was removed, and they were, in fact, regularly recognised at law.*

With these preliminary remarks, our readers will be able to appreciate a remarkable but obscure case, of which we have no contemporary record, and only catch a glimpse through so suspicious a medium of information as Lord Coke, but which very probably occurred in some way substantially as he states it, and which contains in itself in solution the whole principle afterwards expounded in the successive statutes of "*præmunire*" and "*provisors*," and consummated in the Reformation. Short as it is, it is pregnant with fatal import and pernicious results.

"The king (Edward I.) presented his clerk to a benefice, who was refused by the Archbishop, for that the Pope, by way of 'provision,' had conferred it on another. The king brought *quare impedit*.* The Archbishop pleaded that the Bishop of Rome† had long time before *provided* to the said church, as *having supreme authority*, and that he could not put him out who was by the Pope's bull in possession; for which, by judgment of the common law, the lands of his whole bishopric were seized into the king's hands during his life." Thus Lord Coke tells the story, asserting that it was a regular legal judgment at common law by which the Archbishop's lands were seized. But there is (as we have seen) no trace of any law by which such a judgment could be given; and most likely the "judgment" was only the arbitrary act of the enraged monarch, quite in accordance with numerous precedents of his predecessors, some of which we have mentioned, and in which they were accustomed to lay violent hands on the property of any prelate who offended them, glad of a pretext for so doing. To give the devil his due, and to do these Norman sovereigns justice, indeed they did not at all try to encroach on the spiritual, simply because they did not care at all about it; all they coveted was the temporal; and if they fettered or crippled the spiritual, it was only indirectly and unintentionally, and in order to enable themselves to *get at* the temporal. Thus we never read that they tried to prevent the exercise by prelates they quarrelled with of their episcopal functions, except it was when, by excommunication,

* A suit to compel the admission of the king's nominee.

† The phrase is Lord Coke's.

they were indirectly affected temporally, but they seemed quite satisfied when they could "seize the *temporalities*." It must be mentioned, moreover, that (in the language of Lingard) our monarchs were not sincere in their hostility to a practice of which they themselves were eager to take advantage. They *solicited provisions themselves*. Scarcely a year elapsed in which they did not obtain several grants of this description *in favour of their own chaplains*. In 1305, Edward obtained no less than *six*. It was only when the Papal provisions interfered with their own plans that they objected, and only *pretended* them to be illegal. That this impudent "judgment" was illegal is palpable. It was a flagrant violation of the Great Charter, and repeatedly confessed by the Crown to be contrary to law, to take the *whole* of a man's property, or to inflict any extravagant or excessive fine, for a mere misdemeanour or contempt. And the Archbishop's conduct, even if as illegal as it was clearly *legal*, amounted at the utmost to no more than a contempt, for which, according to the charters and the common law, a *reasonable* fine should have been imposed. And especially is this case monstrous when it is observed that the property seized was not the Archbishop's, except in right of his Church, and was *Church* property, which could not rationally or legally be seized for a contempt of the Archbishop. It is important to remark all this at the outset, because the statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors* really only enact this case and its principle into law, and *profess* to re-enact the common law of England; whereas the case was *not* law, but contrary to law, and the common law was not re-enacted, but violated and outraged. That the Crown was constantly outraging and encroaching upon the Church this very king confesses in the "statute of Westminster I," where he says that "*the state (estate) of holy Church hath been evil kept, and the prelates and religious persons grieved many ways;*" and how "grieved" we have just seen. Indeed nothing can be more curious than the callousness with which these arbitrary kings oppressed the Church, and the carelessness with which they *confessed* it. And once for all, to convince every one out of the mouth of the Crown itself that such cases as that cited by Lord Coke were contrary to law, let us cite one of these confessions from a statute of no less a monarch than Edward III.,—the very king in whose reign the statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors* passed, and who, like Edward I., was a proud, powerful, and despotic prince. He and his Parliament say (19 Edw. III.), "*that whereas the temporalities of Archbishops and Bishops have been oftentimes taken into the king's hands for contempts*

done to him, the justices who shall henceforth give judgment against any prelate in such case or the like shall *receive a reasonable fine.*" And again, to shew how usual similar encroachments were, but at the same time how they were *known and confessed to be* encroachments, let us cite one or two more confessions. It is stated in a statute 9 Edward II. that "the king's letters have been directed to ordinaries that (who) have *wrapped* those that be in subjection unto them in the sentence of excommunication, that they should assoil (absolve) them by a certain day, or appear and shew cause," &c.: "*no such letter shall henceforth be suffered to go forth,*" &c. And again, it is cited in 15 Edw. III., "that commissions have been recently made to justices that they shall make inquiries as to whether the judges of holy Church make just process *in causes which notoriously pertain to the cognisance of holy Church*: such commissions shall be repealed." Not to weary our readers with citations, it may suffice to say once for all, that they are usual and common all through succeeding reigns, and significantly shew a *constant system of encroachment on the part of the Crown against the Church*. Those, therefore, who, after the example of Lord Coke (men like Mr. Irons for instance), content themselves with collecting and citing all the most monstrous cases of outrage upon the Church, as if they were legal and justifiable, instead of being illegal, tyrannical, and unjustifiable, evince either inconceivable ignorance or enormous disingenuousness.

What kind of a king Edward I. was,—how worthy a successor of Henry II. and precursor of Henry VIII.,—may be gathered from the following extract out of Lingard:

"Under the pretence of a crusade, he obtained from Pope Nicholas IV. the tenth of all ecclesiastical benefices for the next six years. In 1294 he had recourse to a bold but despotic expedient. Commissioners were appointed to search the treasuries of every church and monastery; the monies deposited in them, whether they were the property of monastic and clerical bodies, or had been placed there for greater security by private individuals, were entered on the rolls of the Exchequer, and the principal sums, under the denomination of *loans*, were carried away for the use of the king. A few months later, he required from the clergy half their income, both from their lay fees and benefices. At this unprecedented demand they were filled with astonishment, and a vigorous opposition was commenced; but the Archbishop of Canterbury had previously left the kingdom. The Dean of St. Paul's, whom they sent to expostulate with the king, expired in his

presence; and Sir John Havering, unexpectedly entering the hall, addressed them thus: ‘Reverend Fathers,—If there be any among you who dares to contradict the royal will, let him stand forth, that his person may be known and noticed as one who has broken the king’s peace.’ At this threat they submitted; and the success of the experiment induced him to repeat it in the following year. From the clergy he then demanded a third. They offered a tenth; which was, after a scornful refusal, accepted. They had now recourse to the Papal authority to shield them from royal extortion; and Boniface VIII. published a bull forbidding the clergy of any Christian country from granting to laymen the revenues of their *benefices* without the permission of the Holy See. Upon this plea, in the next year, they resisted the king’s demand of a fifth. The Archbishop addressed the commissioners thus: ‘You know that, under God, we have two lords—the one spiritual, the other temporal. Obedience is due to both; but *more to the spiritual*. We are willing to do every thing in our power, and will send deputies at our expense to consult the Pontiff.’ Edward then *issued a proclamation of outlawry against the clergy, regular and secular, and took possession of all their lay fees, goods, and chattels, for the benefit of the Crown*. Before the king’s writs were issued, however, the Archbishop of York with his clergy had *compounded* by the grant of a fifth, to avert the royal displeasure” (disregarding the *Papal* prohibition). “In the province of Canterbury the officials of the Crown took possession of all clerical property, real and personal; and intimation was made to the owners, that whatever was not redeemed before Easter would be irrecoverably forfeited. The Convocation assembled on Mid-Lent Sunday. As long as they remained together, their constancy was invincible; they adhered to their former resolution, and determined to suffer with patience every privation; but the moment Convocation was dissolved, a few eagerly sought the royal favour. Their example was quickly followed; some deposited sums of money in places where they might be seized by the officers of the Exchequer, and others purchased at arbitrary prices letters of protection. Still there remained many who refused to descend to such expedients; and the Archbishop, a man of inflexible resolution, retired with a single chaplain to a parsonage in the country, where he discharged the functions of a curate, and subsisted on the alms of the parishioners. Of his suffragans, the Bishop of Lincoln alone imitated his example; but the friends of that prelate subscribed the sum required by the king, and obtained the restoration of his temporalities. Had Edward confined his

rapacity to the *clergy*, he might have continued to despise their remonstrances; but the aids he annually raised on the *freeholders*, the tallages he so frequently demanded of the *cities and boroughs*, and the additional duties he extorted from the *merchants*, excited a general spirit of discontent, and preparations were made for resistance. Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, Marshal of England, refused the command of his army abroad. Edward in a paroxysm of rage exclaimed, ‘By the everlasting God, Sir Earl, you shall go or hang!’ ‘By the everlasting God, Sir King,’ replied Bigod, ‘I will neither go nor hang!’ and he departed, followed by fifteen hundred knights. The royal officers, intimidated, ceased to levy the purveyance. Edward saw it was necessary to dissemble; *received the Primate with kindness, and ordered the restoration of his lands.* A few years after, Edward charged the Primate with having entered into a treasonable conspiracy. The Pontiff suspended him provisionally, and summoned him to plead his cause in the Papal court. He remained two years there, but returned with honour; and the historians praise him for his resistance to the king’s exactions, and his courage in protesting against the oppressions of the people.”

What can be more absurd than to represent the arbitrary acts of such a king as *law*? or the concurrence of the laity as anything better than a selfish connivance at the plunder of the clergy, in order to avert the royal rapacity from themselves?—a concurrence which lasted just as long as it suited the convenience of the laity, who, when the shoe pinched *them*, began to resist, but who would have acquiesced in the robbery of the clergy as long as the king pleased. The people in those times knew better. They were well aware that such things were *not law*; and they proceeded to *make them law*. If the “case” stated by Lord Coke were clear *law*, there could have been no occasion for the celebrated statute of *provisors*, 25 Edward III. (1352), which recites that “the Church of England was *founded* (*i. e.* according to the old meaning of the word, and as the context itself clearly shews, *endowed*) by the king and his progenitors, and the nobles of the realm and their ancestors, to inform them and the people of the law of God, and to make hospitalities and alms and other works of charity in the places where the churches were founded (*i. e.* *endowed*); and certain *possessions* of lands, &c. were *assigned by the said founders* to the prelates and people of holy Church, to sustain the said charge.” Such is the legislative *preface* or statement of facts: what inference is deduced from it? “And the king and nobles have, and ought to have had, the custody of voidances and *presentments and collations of benefices of such pre-*

lacies." That is, in other words, that because the ancestors of "the king and his nobles" had endowed the Church with part of their lands, "the king and his nobles" had a right, as a legal return or equivalent for such endowment, to present prelates to the bishoprics, or priests to the benefices. It is sufficient to shew the impudence of this claim to say (as we have already remarked), that the "ancestors of the king and his nobles" never set it up, and never pretended to have *purchased* such a legal right of patronage or presentment, or to have made their gifts to God and his Church the *price* of a valuable return; and if those who gave the lands never purchased such a right, how could their successors pretend to it, especially as the "right" claimed was a right over the very lands which had been *given away*? And the statute, with the strange stupidity of dishonesty, actually recites that the ancestors of the king and his nobles had *given away* the lands to the Church, and yet asserts a right in the successors over those very lands, which were the absolute property of the Church, held by a tenure known to the law, and with which lay lords had no concern whatever.*

The statute, however, absurdly assuming that the heirs of those who had given land away retained a right of control over it, proceeded to recite as the grievance complained of, that "the Pope doth give the said *possessions* and *benefices* as if he were patron thereof," &c. Nothing is said as to the sees or cures of souls; the sordid laity cared not for that; all their anxiety was as to the *possessions*; and the *gist* of the complaint is at the end: "And doth give the same to *aliens* who never dwell in England, and cardinals who cannot dwell there; and thereby *great treasure is carried away.*" Some of our Protestant friends have, amusingly enough, laid hold of this passage to prove the dislike our Catholic ancestors felt to cardinals, ignorant that the statute-book shews several instances of exemption made *in favour* of cardinals, *provided they would "dwell here,"* our ancestors having had the sense to see it was a great *honour* to have a cardinal resident in the country, their only objection being to cardinals *non-resident*.† In truth, however, the real reason of the statute was not this of non-residence, but that which is so pathetically and expressively added, "last not least," that "*thereby great treasure is carried away.*" "Ay, there's the rub!" These words are the more remarkable because repeated in almost every

* See Littleton as to tenure and frankalmoigne, cited in the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*, &c.

† See Thomson's *Magna Charta*, and the recitals of all the great charters, in which a cardinal is sure to figure.

subsequent statute on the same subject down to those of Henry VIII. We have sufficiently shewn how prone the king and his nobles were to use their patronage for the purpose of putting money in their pockets, and we can conceive their repugnance to treasure being carried away from them. The object of the act is simply to secure to them the legal power of exercising their patronage, and of presenting one of their dependents, or perhaps even *purchasers*, to the vacant bishopric or benefice. The infamy of the proposition it is elaborately attempted to disguise by flimsy pretences of hypocrisy about non-residence, &c.; but no Catholic really need be reminded that even if evils occasionally arose (as by reason of non-residence) from any particular exercise of a prerogative in the Holy See, such abuse formed no excuse for resistance to that prerogative. And more especially is this obviously only a pretence of hypocrisy in the present case, because the Popes repeatedly made "constitutions" to prevent pluralities or non-residence, and the records of the English courts of law at this very time disclose that these constitutions were constantly put in execution. Moreover, our readers will not require to be reminded of what they have remarked all along with respect to the opposition to papal provisions, that the real reason why they were objected to was, not that the persons presented were *non-resident* (of which we read nothing in the previous agitations against the practice, and of which we can easily see the instances must have been rare, as the remedy was easy), but that they were *foreigners*. And let us repeat what it is all-important to remark, that no complaint is, even down to this very statute itself, made as to the "provisors" being persons improper or incompetent for their cures or sees (exceptional cases apart); and on the contrary, the most flagrant corruptions commonly occurring in kingly presentations, while on the other hand the papal presentments were as commonly good, and some of our most saintly prelates were "aliens," although "aliens" who *did* "dwell here." After such hypocritical reasons in the reciting part, the statute proceeds in the "enacting part" (as the lawyers call it) to ordain "that *free elections* of archbishops, bishops, and other dignities and benefices elective, shall *hold* henceforth, as *granted* by the king's progenitors and the ancestors of other lords, founders of the said dignities and other benefices." The sense in which the "king's progenitors and the ancestors of other lords" had "granted free elections," was just the same as the sense in which they had "founded" the said "dignities and benefices;" that is, they had *given lands*, &c. to the dignities, or benefices, to be holden by the persons "freely elect-

ed" or canonically appointed thereto. The sense in which the Crown and Parliament now used the phrase "free elections" was, as our readers will probably suspect, a somewhat different sense; seeing that if it were the *same*, no statute would be more senseless, since the law already secured the temporalities to the persons "freely elected" or canonically appointed to the said "benefices or dignities." It is sufficiently clear that the "free elections" for which the "king and his nobles" professed such an extreme but somewhat insincere anxiety, were elections free from any such controlling power of the Pope as had been found to check the corruptions of "patronage;" and so the statute proceeds to enact, "that all the people of holy Church" (*i. e.* especially the "king and his nobles") "who have advowsons of any benefices" (*i. e.* usurped right of patronage) "shall have their collations and presentments free," *i. e.* exercise their "patronage" as corruptly as they please, "free" from any control of the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and "that in case that *reservation, collation, or provision*" (*general words*) "be made by the Court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, or benefice, in disturbance of the free elections, collations, or presentations aforesaid"—what then? why—"that *our lord the king* shall have the collations to the said archbishoprics and bishoprics or benefices" which be—(our lord the king, who with his nobles, had all along been the chief cause of the "disturbance of free elections," by the pernicious corruption incident to the usurped "patronage")—"which be of his own advowing, as his progenitors had before free election was granted." His "progenitors" who never had the bishoprics "in their advowing" at all, and never knew what "advowsons" meant, and never pretended to this corrupted right of "patronage," and never "granted" "free election," but only gave their property to those who should be freely elected. Truly Mr. Walpole was right in calling this statute "extraordinary and memorable." It was melancholy as well as "memorable," an "extraordinary instance," or rather an ordinary and extremely *natural* instance, of the way in which men's *interests* will warp their consciences, and impel them to the utmost to maintain a system whence they derive an illicit advantage.

That this "memorable" statute, so far from being in accordance, as Lord Coke, with his characteristic audacity on this subject, affirms, was in contravention and violation of it, is clear from this alone, that cases constantly occur in which it is set at naught in the courts of law, and in which, despite its enactments, papal "provisions" and appointments are recognised at *law*. Thus 41 Edw. III., though pertaining *pro-*

fessedly only to the temporalities, was designed to *defeat*, and not to *affirm*, the common law; for that (as laid down by Bracton) recognised the Pope as having supreme power to appoint to bishoprics or benefices, *i. e.* the sees or cures of souls; and also recognised the principle that the temporal *followed* the spiritual, and that thus the papal presentees acquired a right to the temporalities attached to those sees or cures, as well by the law of the land as by the law of the Church. The effect of this statute was to *change* this, and to declare that by *law* the papal presentee or "provisor" had no right to the see or cure, that is to say, no right to the temporalities attached thereto, which was all the law claimed cognisance of, at all events *then*. This, however, was the commencement of an evil course of resisting and restraining the free exercise of the papal supremacy; and the effect of this celebrated statute, to sum it up plainly and shortly, was simply this, to say to the Pope: We admit your supremacy as our holy Father, and your right to appoint to all our sees or cures; but we care so much more for the temporalities attached thereto than for the spiritualities, that if you choose to *exert* your right, and give the *latter* to *other* persons, when we wish to prefer our friends or dependents (which we cannot prevent you from doing), we will deprive them of the *former*."

We call this the first formal legislative deflection towards the fatal consummation of the Reformation. How rapidly the process of divergence progressed will be seen from the simple fact, that only *two* years after the passing of this act, the first of a series of statutes of *præmunire*, as they were called, was enacted, the chief scope of which was to prevent people from resorting to the See of Rome to enforce the papal provisions. The sole weapon of the Church of course was, as it always has been, the force of spiritual censure, and chiefly *excommunication*. It is instructive to observe the inevitable *progression* of wrong-doing, and the insidious nature of the encroachments of the Crown. Originally the only objection was (as we have seen) as to the *temporalities*; and the Pope's right as to the *spiritualities* of sees or cures of souls, that is, his right to appoint the *pastor*, was not at all interfered with. Practically, however, it was found impossible to have two incumbents; one claiming the temporalities under the king, or other lay patron; the other the spiritualities under the Pope, the "sovereign patron," as the *law* called him, or (as the Church called him) rather, the Supreme Pastor of holy Church: and the bishop would, of course, in the case of an incumbent, or the archbishop in the case of a bishop, be bound to induct or confirm only *one*, and to excommunicate

the other; so that the two jurisdictions, temporal and spiritual, must clash. And Parliament indirectly decided that the spiritual should be superseded, and the temporal be supreme, for the statutes of *præmunire* rendered final the pronouncing or execution. Nearly twenty years after the statute passed, we find it *pleaded against the Crown* that "our holy Father the Pope reserved to himself the bishopric, and gave it to a dependant; and that afterwards the king reciting by his patent that the Pope had presented to the dependant the bishopric, granted to him the temporalities," and the Crown counsel do not in the least object to the plea; but on the contrary confirm it by arguing "that after the party was presented, he had to be confirmed by the Pope, and the Pope might refuse him." And one of the judges says, "*when the Pope has given the benefice (i. e. see) to a bishop, he has time to accept or not.*" And another says, "*when he is confirmed by the Pope, and his temporalities are delivered to him by the king, he has all that a bishop should have; he has both the spiritualities and the temporalities.*" This and similar cases, decided *after* the statute of provisors,* clearly shew that it removed any subject of any spiritual sentence or censure of the Pope or any English prelate, in enforcement of a papal provision against the nomination of the Crown or any lay patron; or in opposition to any sentence of the king's courts, or what *they* might choose to consider secular causes, of which *they*, the lay courts, were thus constituted sole judges. And here it will be observed that the Crown and the state were committed, legislatively, to a claim of control over that purely spiritual power of the Church, the sentence of excommunication, which, as we have seen, was under the Anglo-Saxon kings, and by the Anglo-Saxon laws, considered exclusively under the control of the Church; as exempt from all state control, and so entitled to state enforcement; which under the Conqueror it had only been attempted to clog with a claim of *notice*, and under Henry II. with a condition of *consent* where the Crown was concerned; but which now, for the first time, wherever it interfered with what the lay courts or the Crown chose to consider secular, was pronounced by Parliament unlawful, and rendered penal.

Our readers will perceive what a progress the encroachments of the Crown had made in a few generations (however indirectly and insidiously) on the *spiritual* province and power of the Church. Now, it is of course of no consequence as to the fact or extent of these encroachments, however much it may serve to shew their character, to remark, that they were all con-

• See the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

ducted *professedly* upon the principle of respecting the *spiritual* prerogative of the Church, and preserving the temporal prerogative of the Crown; because as the Crown was constituted judge of what was temporal, it was virtually, although indirectly, made, in an *executive* sense, and as to the *exercise* of the spiritual power of the Church, at least in a particular class of cases, supreme. In short, the Crown could not get at the property of the Church, and parcel it out among courtiers or courtier-like clergy, except by fettering the spiritual power of the Church, so far as it interfered with the sordid system of *patronage* and traffic in bishoprics and benefices, which we have shewn the Crown and a corrupt laity and clergy had long carried on. The Pope inconveniently interfered with the worldliness of the Crown and the nation, and they cordially combined in an act of *covert* and *indirect* rebellion against him whom they yet professed to recognise as their holy Father.

It is important to distinguish between such encroachments of the Crown as really, though indirectly, affected the spiritual (such as those we have just mentioned), and such as only affected the temporal rights of the Church,—such as the statute of mortmain, passed in the reign of Edward I. It is more important, however, to observe that the same spirit which dictated these encroachments on the temporal rights of the Church led to encroachments on the spiritual, so soon as it was seen to be requisite to control the spiritual for the sake of securing the temporal; and it must likewise be carefully kept in view that the chief causes for the concurrence of the laity with the Crown in constant encroachments upon the Church was that jealousy in respect to *money*, which led the laity and the clergy equally to complain of the payment of “first fruits,” or of the practice of Papal “provisions;” and these feelings, which were increasing in the nation all through the reigns of the first three Edwards, led logically, naturally, and necessarily to constant indirect interference with the exercise of the Pope’s spiritual powers, especially of excommunication, and to attempts to exclude his bulls or rescripts, under the pretence that they interfered with the royal prerogative; the truth being that they often interfered with royal *tyranny*, such as we have shewn sufficient specimens of. We read in Lingard that no prince seems to have carried this jealousy further than Edward II.; and it is curious, and serves to shew that the encroachments of the Crown—or rather, we should now say, of the State or secular power—were quite as much, or more, owing to the jealousy of the laity of the clergy, and the clergy as to the See of Rome (in consequence of their

worldliness and corruption), than to the rapacity of the Crown, that these encroachments should have gone to greater lengths under weak and unworthy princes, such as the second Edward and the second Richard, than under kings as powerful as the first and third Edwards. And it was in the reign of Richard II. that the most sweeping statute of *præmunire* was passed—that celebrated statute which was made by Henry VIII. the engine with which to enforce on the English clergy the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy, and which indeed was drawn in terms so large and loose as almost to include in its prohibitions any exercise of papal power which the Crown should choose to conceive, and get the Crown courts to adjudge, to be an interference with the royal “prerogative,” or rather the royal will. This is the statute which has of late been so often referred to, usually with the most intense ignorance. Its preamble (which is particularly instructive) recites that archbishops and bishops were “wont to make execution of the judgments” given in the king’s courts on presentments to churches, &c.; but “of late processes be made to our holy Father the Pope, and censures of excommunication *against certain Bishops of England* because they have made execution of such judgments;” *i. e.* of judgments of the king’s lay courts *upon and against* the spiritual rights of the Church—the appointment of pastors to their sees or cures, albeit these spiritual rights were connected with temporal endowments. The reader will remark that the recitals of this statute disclose the consummation of a new era in the history of the English Church—that hitherto it has been, at least generally, the “king and his nobles” who have been opponents of the Pope, now it is the whole body of the Bishops. Hitherto it has been usually in *defence* of the Bishops that the “censures and sentences of excommunication” of the Holy See were denounced; now it is *against* them. In short, it is plain that the Bishops were, with the king and his nobles, “*rebels*” against the supreme Pastor of the Church. And this is more plain from what follows: “And it is *said*” (by the Bishops) “that our holy Father the Pope hath purposed to translate certain prelates of the realm, and some out of the realm, without the *king’s assent, and without the assent of the said prelates.*” The king and his prelates are here, it is obvious, coupled together as co-conspirators against the Holy See. And how came they to have this common interest—this “*idem velle atque nolle*”—that certain sign of a corrupt community of motive and aim? The next sentence sufficiently explains: “Whereby our lord the king shall *lose the counsel and services* of the said prelates;” which “counsel and services,” it is

shewn by contemporary history, they were wont to render to "our lord the king" in certain secular offices (such as chancellor and treasurer), with which prelates had no proper concern, but which brought the said prelates great pelf and power and "pride of place." Here, then, it is obvious, it is the cloven hoof of sordid self-interest raised in rebellion against the Holy See, and a spirit of covert resistance to his spiritual authority, caused by a secret *love of secular employment and emoluments*, which his authority interfered with; and that the prelates were conscious of the unsafe ground they had ventured upon is plain from the shuffling and insidious character of the terms in which their assent is expressed in the preamble to this statute. They "protest that it is not in their mind *to affirm or deny* that our holy Father the Pope may excommunicate Bishops, or translate them without their assent," &c.,—(they durst not deny, and they could not affirm)—"but they say, that *if* such excommunications or translations be made so that the substance of the realm may be consumed," (as the Commons had alleged), "and that the same is against the king, his crown and regalty—the lords spiritual will be with the king in these cases—in *lawfully* maintaining his crown;" which, of course, they might well be without the least complaint on the part of their "holy Father the Pope." After such a crafty and hypocritical preamble, the reader will be prepared for the enacting part of the statute, which is contained in this short and oft-quoted and oft-misapplied sentence, of which it is sufficiently clear that the lords spiritual were thoroughly ashamed:

"That if any purchase or pursue any processes, sentences of excommunication, *bulls*, instruments, or other things *which touch the king, his crown, regalty, or realm*, they shall be put out of the king's protection. Now it is true that (as has been elsewhere, we conceive, legally proved,* and even in these articles sufficiently shewn) the crown and regalty comprised by the law of the land nothing spiritual, and was purely temporal. But then the *king's courts* of law would have to decide what *was* temporal; and we have recently had illustrations of the large meaning which a secular body would attach to that word; and how it will *perforce* be construed to include *any thing, however spiritual*, which is *inconvenient to the State*; as it *was* construed, too often, even in these times by judges who would be in peril of their lives for "contumacy."

That this statute, and all the others which it embraced and embodied, was not in *accordance* with the law, but was *contrary* to it, can be clearly seen from the facts already stated in these

* In the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

articles, and is confirmed by these farther and remarkable facts: that the bill was so opposed in the House of Lords that it was withdrawn, and a very unconstitutional kind of arrangement made by the Commons with the Crown that the king should alter it by the advice of his council, and that it should be laid before Parliament again; that it *never was again laid before Parliament*; and that it *does not appear upon the rolls of Parliament*. But there *does* appear upon the rolls of Parliament a protest of the Lords Spiritual that they consented to *no* enactment against the prerogative of the Pontiff with respect to provisions, or against the rights and liberties of the Church. It may therefore be contended that this statute, recently so much referred to as undoubted law, is not only in opposition to the common law, but *never was law itself*—never legally passed into an act of parliament!

Still, in point of *fact*, it was acted upon (whenever it suited the Crown to enforce it) to the extent already described, and therefore marks, in some degree, an indirect encroachment on the Church. The lay courts of the Crown judged what was an interference with the “crown and regalty” of the realm; and though it can be shewn in the law cases of succeeding reigns that the courts always upheld the distinctions between the spiritual and the temporal, as laid down by the earlier authorities, and restricted these statutes to the latter, they had the power, under such an act as that of Richard II., to do almost what they pleased, or what it might please the Crown to compel them to; and in an after age, when arbitrary power was established, they were always ready to enforce it against the Church whenever the Crown had a contest with her, or whenever the Crown chose to enter into conflict with, and seek to crush, any of her prelates or clergy.

What effect upon the Church and the country the Crown's interference with papal appointments had, was powerfully apparent in the reign of Henry V., when we find that both the Universities presented petitions to Convocation, setting forth that *while the Popes were permitted to confer benefices by provision, the preference had always been given to men of talents and industry*, who had obtained degrees in the Universities; but that since the passing of the acts against provisors, members of the Universities had been neglected by the patrons, the students had disappeared, and the schools were nearly abandoned. Sixteen years later the *House of Commons petitioned the king that the statutes against provisors might be repealed, or an adequate remedy provided*. He informed them that he had referred the matter to the bishops; but the *prelates had no wish that the statutes should be repealed*. These remark-

able facts convincingly demonstrate, it is conceived, the propositions for which we have contended, that the legislation against papal provisions was an *encroachment* contrary to the ancient law of the land, that it originated in sordid, selfish, and interested motives, and that it was injurious to the Church and to the country. Let us add, that Lingard states: "The persons who chiefly suffered from the practice of provisions, and who chiefly profited by the statutes against them, were *the higher orders of clergy, who had originally provoked the complaints against the system*, and now desired to prevent the repeal of a statute which secured to them the influence of patronage, and shielded them from the interference of the Pontiffs."

That these statutes were not regarded as really of legal authority, is shewn further by this: that they were very much allowed to be evaded by the judges in the ensuing reigns, even where the Crown sought to put them in execution; and cases constantly occur up to the reign of Henry VIII. in which the Pope's supreme power, either of deprivation or provision, is recognised* in the courts of law. Thus in several cases the court speaks of the Pope's power of deprivation, and in others of his power of collating or presenting. In one case in the reign of Henry IV., the chief-justice uses these remarkable words: "When the Pope (*l'apostle*) makes provision, he does so as *sovereign patron of holy Church*." Finally, in the 12th Henry VIII., only a few years before the breach with Rome, the law is impliedly recognised by the chief-justice speaking of an incumbent being "in possession by *collation of the Pope*."

Upon these grounds it is contended that all these statutes were successive encroachments upon the Church, contrary to the common law and ancient constitution of the realm, and caused by the rapacity of the Crown, and the sordid jealousy of the wealthier of the clergy and laity. That, in short, they were so many emphatic embodiments of that same cursed spirit of *mammon* which we shall see was the undermining cause of those statutes of Henry VIII., which were natural and inevitable consequences of the course pursued by the State in preceding reigns, being founded upon precisely the same principle—the determination to make the temporal supreme over the spiritual—the identical principle in our own times so often emphatically avowed by Lord John Russell (in worthy sympathy with the sentiments of the benefactor of his ancestor), and repeatedly enunciated in Parliament by erastian Protestants and subservient Catholics. That this was so, and that the encroachments upon the Church were really the result of the worldliness and corruption of the clergy, not less than

* See them cited in the *Catholic Hierarchy vindicated*.

of the rapacity of the Crown, is remarkably illustrated in that period of our history at which, in our review, we have now arrived—the period which intervened between the reigns of Richard II. and Richard III. inclusively, that is to say, chiefly the reigns of the three Henrys, IV., V., and VI., a period which likewise, and not less so, illustrates the *retribution* which is sure to be required for aggressions upon the Church. It is remarkable that the reign of Edward III., marked by the most deliberate legislative encroachment on the Church, was followed by a disgraceful and disastrous reign, which, as it witnessed the most decisive and comprehensive legislation against the Church, likewise, in its turn, was closed by successful rebellion, from which arose long and desolating wars, which ravaged England during the six succeeding reigns, almost utterly destroyed the English nobility, who had ever been the leaders in assaults on the Church, and by prostrating the power of the peers, so exalted that of the Crown that Henry VII. reigned more despotically than any former monarch, and by his rapacity paved the way for those further aggressions on the Church, in open robbery, plunder, and rapine, which could only be accomplished under cover of a religious reformation, or rather by fatal separation, heresy, and schism.

The progress and succession of all these influences—the close connexion of cause and effect between the events which they produced—their real character and ultimate inevitable result, are, we repeat, clearly illustrated in the era comprised under the reigns of the three Henries. And not the least instructive thing to be observed is, that the same spirit which prompted the peers to promote, and the people to acquiesce in, aggression on the papal supremacy, produced, and so proved its secret sympathy with, a spirit of *heresy*. Not long before the reign of the first of these monarchs, Henry IV., the most distinguished among those proud peers, who had been so eager to promote legislation against “provisions,” and against the exercise of the papal supremacy, and its enforcement by the sentence of excommunication—were found, in manifest and admonitory consistency, openly and impudently abetting the first great teacher of heresy, the hypocrite and impostor Wycliffe. When the arch-deceiver was summoned by the Archbishop to appear before him to answer the accusation of heresy, there appeared with him, in ostentatious avowal of contempt for the heads of the Church, the two most powerful subjects of the Crown—the Duke of Lancaster, and Percy the Earl Marshal, who ordered a chair to be given to Wycliffe; and on the prelate’s refusing this insolent demand, became so insulting in their demeanour, that the people rose in indig-

nation. The duke, the king's son, narrowly escaped with his life, and his palace was pillaged. The consequence was, that Wycliffe, deprived of that popular support which is the life of heresy, found it necessary to make the best apology in his power, and to submit to the imposition of silence on the subjects on which he had put forth his heretical ideas. It is impossible not to see that the *people* here saved the country and the Church, being yet not so far corrupted by those influences which had such a pernicious effect on the higher classes. It is interesting to observe that it was from no sympathy with the *heresy* of Wycliffe that John of Gaunt gave him his countenance; for so soon as he perceived him inclined to be obstinate in heretical opinions, he withdrew that countenance, which clearly had arisen from those feelings of aversion and jealousy towards the heads of the Church, which had led to so many aggressions upon her. Again, it is important to observe that Wycliffe was one of the higher and courtier class of clergy, who, on the one hand, we have seen were most worldly, and on the other hand, as the result of this worldliness, were most disposed to depress the Church by exalting the power of the Crown at the expense of that of the Pope: so true is it, and so instructive is it to observe, that heretics in all countries and in every age instinctively cling to the *secular* power, and shrink from the spiritual. Wycliffe was one of the *king's chaplains*; that very class who, so long ago as the age of the Confessor, had begun to bring in, through the hateful effect of royal favour and clerical corruption, the evil of plurality and worldliness and love of money; and as these men were the commencement of the decline of the Church, so they were its consummation; for we need scarcely remind our readers of Wycliffe's successor in the work of schism and heresy—Cranmer, who likewise was a king's chaplain. And so identical is the spirit of heresy, we find of the former as of the latter, that he endeavoured to promote the claims of the Crown against the supremacy of the Holy See; not, however, until after, like his successor, he had become party to an *appeal* to Rome, and had failed. Nor must it be unnoticed, that in Wycliffe's case, as in Cranmer's, the claim he had carried to Rome was an iniquitous one; for it arose from that same worldly and rapacious spirit to which we have traced his patron's legislative aggressions upon the Church. There is yet another thing important to be noticed in this episode of Wycliffe,—that expressive illustration of the intimate and instinctive sympathy between the spirit of worldliness and of heresy, and the inevitable connexion of both with rebellion against the papal supremacy,—that it exhibited

that uniform accompaniment of heresy, *hypocrisy*; for he who was so worldly himself, a rapacious pluralist, and a courtier preferment-seeking cleric, preached most pathetically against the evils of worldliness in others, and one of his main errors was that the clergy should not hold worldly wealth.

And this leads us to a very instructive passage in the history of the reign of Henry IV., which amply illustrates and confirms all that previous citations have tended to shew. A sect had arisen who had carried out Wycliffe's heretical ideas, especially as to the possession of property by the clergy, to a fanatical extent. Towards the end of the reign, in 1407, they attracted the attention of the Lords, who sent a petition (or "bill") to the Commons for their concurrence, which was afterwards presented by the speaker to the king. It recited that "the preachers excited the people to take away the possessions of the Church, of which the clergy were as assuredly endowed as temporal lords were of their inheritances; and that unless these evil purposes were speedily resisted, it was probable that, in process of time, they would also move the people to take away the possessions and inheritances of the temporal lords." How prophetic of that retributive sequel of the Reformation—the Rebellion! But now, let it be observed, four years later, Henry asked a "fifteenth" of the laity and a "tenth" of the clergy. Both bodies resisted; but the *Commons, to shift the burden from themselves, advised the king to lay it on the Church.* From her *superfluous* revenues (they pretended) he might maintain a large army, and also (incomparable hypocrisy! how it reminds one of the "not that he cared for the poor" of Judas, the betrayer of Christ—fit precursor of these betrayers of the Church!) *support one hundred hospitals for the relief of the poor.* When the king called for the grounds of their calculation, they had none to offer, and he treated the proposition with well-merited contempt; thus proving that by this time the kings, bad as they were, were better than the upper orders of the laity. And it is unaccountable how any writers upon the Reformation, whether Protestant or Catholic, should have omitted to attach due importance to the significant fact that scarcely more than a century before that shocking catastrophe, its dread drama of confiscation should have been thus *sketched out by the Commons of England, and rejected with scorn by the Crown!*

And this appears the proper time for mentioning, that in the next reign statutes were passed, which Henry VIII., when he put in execution this shameful scheme of the Commons, must have found useful precedents, as we shall see hereafter.

Before citing some of their terms, we must mention that the rejection by the Crown of the Commons' scheme of confiscation seems to *have quenched their zeal against heresy*; for we find that they sought to shrink from their bill against the "Lollards," which, however, remained law, the first formal act against heresy on our statute-book.

Here, however, want of space compels us to pause. In our next No. the subject will be brought to its conclusion.

Passion, Love, and Rest;

OR,

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BASIL MORLEY.

(Concluded from p. 207.)

CHAPTER XII.—*Rest.*

AFTER the wedding tour, Edith and I returned to Morley Court, where my father wished us to live, as he could not bear the thought of absolute solitude. There we passed our days, enjoying to the full the many blessings we possessed, both spiritual and temporal. Cumberland was a frequent visitor, and I now and then reminded him of what he had said to me respecting the troubles with which even the life of a Catholic is ever chequered. Whenever I said any thing in this strain, he bade me beware, not of sorrow, not of pleasure, but of myself.

"Our worst enemy," he used to repeat, "rely upon it, is within us. In fact, self is too often a *traitor*. Life, my dear Morley, is only beginning with you. Trust God, and distrust yourself, and all will be well in the end; but don't flatter yourself that as yet you know much of the struggle of life. When you least expect it, the conflict will begin."

In some way or other these words of his made a considerable impression on me, though on my thoughts rather than on my feelings. A few months after my marriage, a silent fear of some unknown evil began to creep over me. The very cloudlessness of my existence was at times too painful to bear. I trembled lest some unforeseen accident should happen to mar our enjoyments or plunge us into calamity. Then I began to ponder over all the possible ills of mortality, and all the great spiritual trials which I had heard or read of

as being the lot of Christians in this life. If I were to reckon up all the imaginary evils which at one time or another I thought over as within the limits of possibility, the catalogue would be little short of the ridiculous. I pursued this plan with the especial object of being prepared for trial when it came. I had no wish (as I imagined) to escape trial altogether, but I wanted not to be taken unawares, thinking that so I should suffer less when sorrow should come. Cumberland clearly saw in what direction my thoughts were used to wander, for he now and then gave me a hint as to the evil of wishing to *choose* our own cross. But I did not then understand him, and he wisely left me to learn by experience what could really be learnt in no other way.

We had been married a year and a half, when Edith became a mother. She was dangerously ill, and for some time her life was despaired of. Then I felt what human agony can amount to. She was prepared for death, but her state was such that I was scarcely permitted to see her, as the agitation would certainly have killed her. With all the sincerity that prayer and struggle could win for me, I made an offering of her to Almighty God, and resigned her into his hands. The cross was fearful to bear, but I stretched out my hands to receive it, and hoped that I was doing it with a perfect will. Suddenly her illness took a favourable turn, and she recovered with unusual rapidity. The infant thrived, was baptised, and again life was full of joy and hope to us both.

One morning I had remarked how completely all traces of illness had left my wife's countenance, and after a short walk with her, I rode over to Cumberland, to ask a question on some immaterial subject. He proposed to ride with me part of the way back, and told me he was about to leave home for a short time on a very difficult and delicate errand, and asked my prayers for its success.

"I am going to visit the Blessed Sacrament before I start," said he, "as I generally do on such occasions; so I shall keep you a few minutes. Suppose you come into the chapel too; one never knows what may happen next, and there are few preparations for the future like those made in the presence of Jesus Christ himself. I want also to shew you a little picture I have just had sent me by a friend from Rome. It is one of those representations which are common enough in Catholic countries, but still rather rare here, though I have no doubt the day will come when they will be seen in almost every Catholic church and chapel in England."

We entered the chapel, and Cumberland pointed out the picture to me. It was small, and as a work of art of slender

pretensions, yet with nothing critically objectionable. It was a figure of our Blessed Lord, shewing his divine Heart, as it were uncovered in his breast. He was represented pointing to it; and underneath were written the words, "My son, give me thy heart." We looked at it for a short time, and then knelt down before the altar. As I bowed down before the Mysterious Presence, the words I had just read seemed to come forth from the tabernacle, and to call me to a more complete surrender of myself to Him who had given himself without sparing for me. Feebly, yet earnestly, I responded to his call, and remained scarcely conscious of any presence but his, and looking forward to the day when I hoped to see Him without veil, and to hear his voice, not only by faith, but coming forth from his throne in heaven; when a touch on my shoulder from Cumberland recalled me to the work of the moment, and we left the chapel. He must have seen traces of unusual emotion in my countenance, for he said nothing during our ride, and when we parted, shook my hand with more than his wonted cordiality, only saying, "Pray for me."

I reached home, pondering on the unspeakable blessedness of the Catholic faith even in this life, and thanking God for the gift He had given me. Entering the hall-door, I started to see one of the servants hurrying towards me, his face pale and terrified.

"For God's sake," I cried, "what is the matter? Where is Mrs. Morley? Where is my father?"

"They are well, sir," said the man; "it is the child!"

I rushed past him upstairs. Two or three maids were standing outside my wife's room, whispering and crying. I threw open the door, but at first saw nothing. Then I perceived Edith on her knees at her bedside, her face buried in her hands, while her whole frame shook with the agitation she was suffering. Before her lay the infant, cold and dead. She heard my cry, but only stretched out one of her hands towards me. I seized it and knelt by her side. Her tears then began to stream fast, and she murmured again and again, "Jesus! Mary!" I could say nothing; but my thoughts in the chapel recurred with piercing force, and it almost seemed as if the words, "My son, give me thy heart," were really breathed into my ears.

Oh, mystery of love and suffering! How can I describe all that mingled tide of anguish, and gratitude, and fear, and joy, and humiliation, and peace, which swept into my heart during the minutes that I passed kneeling before my child's motionless body! At last we grew calmer, and by a simul-

taneous impulse arose. Edith was composed, to a degree that seemed almost miraculous; and from that hour I never heard the faintest shade of murmur pass her lips. For many weeks she suffered much, but her conversation about her infant was full of peace and gratitude; and after the funeral she told me that she had that day known a depth of sorrow and a depth of happiness such as she had never even imagined before.

For myself, I felt the infant's death far more than I had thought possible. But it had this happy effect on me, that Cumberland's often-repeated warning about wanting to choose my own crosses had now a more living and practical force on my whole life. In all my surmises and anticipations, so it happened that I had never thought of my child's sudden death. The surprise, therefore, added to the keenness of the shock; so that, though the loss of a young infant is one of the gentlest of all the afflictions with which a Catholic parent can be tried, yet it gave me a knowledge of myself to which hitherto I had been almost a stranger.

We soon got into our old routine of life again; but Edith's health not being very good, the doctor advised travelling and change of scene. My father, who, though still a Protestant, was greatly attached to Edith, travelled with us. We sometimes, though not often, talked on the great question. One day he had seemed remarkably moved by what I had said respecting the spiritual *power* of Catholicism, and its independence of all human means for its support and propagation. He admitted that Catholics did seem to possess a knowledge of the invisible world, and a faculty for communion with God and the Saints, wholly unknown to the best of Protestants. This was ever a truth which commanded my own especial admiration, as it was a perception of the spiritual and intellectual hollowness of every form of Protestantism which had first driven me to examine into the claims of the Catholic Church.

That same evening I was walking alone among the ruins of a venerable abbey near the town of —, where we were to pass the following day, which was Sunday. The setting sun shone softly through the shattered tracery, and gave a kind of ethereal life to the wreck of ancient Catholic splendour which lay all around me, now silent for centuries. At such a time who could help re-people the shadowy aisles with kneeling worshippers, and inhaling in imagination the cloud of incense as it rose before the altar which had stood where now thistles and brambles alone were seen? "Oh, wonderful faith," I murmured to myself, "which nothing human can destroy! It fell in its days of riches, only to re-

vive in its days of poverty. And still more incomprehensible unbelief! How *can* this nation remain in its blindness? How *can* such a man as my father content himself with the shadow, when the substance is within his grasp? How is it *possible* to be a Protestant? How stupid, how inconsistent, how unattractive, how unspiritual, how baseless, is Protestantism, at its best! Really," I thought, "I can hardly understand the state of mind which rejects it; and yet I hear of Catholics themselves who are conscious of difficulties, though of course they do not yield to them in any such way as to have any admitted doubts against the faith. Oh, if Protestants only knew what it *is* to be a Catholic, they must yield at once!"

Returning to the inn where we were lodging, I found the priest who had the charge of the mission of — in conversation with my father and my wife. A less attractive person, at first sight, I had seldom seen. Square-built and short, with no trace of the ecclesiastic in his dress, barbarous in his pronunciation of English, possessing (as I soon found) a very slight knowledge of Latin, and altogether guiltless of Greek, what with the uncouthness of his manners, his misplaced aspirates, and his evident want of general education, I sat on thorns during his visit, fearing the injurious effect his very unromantic character might have on my father's nascent faith in the Catholic Church. After a tolerably long visit, Mr. Smith (which was his name) took his leave.

"A good, honest, straightforward sort of a man, that, Basil!" cried my father, as our visitor's retreating footsteps were heard down the creaking staircase of the country inn. Infinitely relieved, I blundered forth an acquiescence, and in a few minutes it was arranged that we should request Mr. Smith to dine with us on the following day.

My father, of course, went with us to Mass, and I trembled with anxiety lest the mode of its celebration should be such as should repel his somewhat fastidious taste. My worst anticipations, so far as the service was concerned, were realised. The chapel was dark, dingy, and Protestant-looking. A few vulgarly smart shopkeepers occupied the best seats, and the chapel, small as it was, was not full. The music was frivolous, and below criticism. The vestments were ugly and dirty, and the serving boys careless in their demeanour. Two of the candles on the altar would not burn, and one of the boys fidgetted about for five or ten minutes in vain attempts to rekindle them. There were long English prayers before and after Mass, recited in a semi-Protestant tone by Mr. Smith, and responded to in a nasal gabble by the serving boys alone, the congregation remaining perfectly silent. The

sermon was indescribably dull, and had only one merit—brevity. When all was over, as we lingered in the chapel, the priest came out, insisted on our coming into his house, shewed us all the contents of his sacristy and sitting-room, and would not rest until he had pointed out to my father every item of certain dilapidated religious ornaments of the worst possible design and execution. Edith took it all quietly, my father was unaffectedly interested and good-humoured, and I was most uncomfortably nervous. As soon as the approach of our dinner-hour gave me an excuse, I hurried the whole party away to our inn, and at one o'clock we sat down together. A chance question of mine, as to the circumstances of the mission, started Mr. Smith off in a direction which I thought must be fatal to our hopes of my father's conversion. Such a picture as he drew I had never heard before. The chapel was overburdened with debt, and the congregation was distracted with squabbles, one half of them being scarcely civil to their priest, on account of the bishop's dismissal of his predecessor against their wishes; there was no school, either on Sundays or week-days; the organist and half the choir were Protestants, who appeared to conduct the music pretty much according to their own discretion; and poor Mr. Smith himself seemed to think all these things unavoidable, natural evils, to be acquiesced in, as the inevitable results of the Protestantism, or bigotry (as he called it) of the English nation. As for hoping to make any impression on the Protestantism around him, in the way of conversions, it did not seem to enter his mind as a possibility. According to his views, the Catholic faith had neither power to convert the Protestant world, nor to rule the hearts of Catholics themselves. Meanwhile he ate an enormous dinner, with abundant apologies for so doing.

Here was a realisation of my dreams of the preceding evening. "What *will* my father say?" I exclaimed to myself. "Was there ever any thing more unlike one's ideal of an apostolic ecclesiastic than this good Mr. Smith? What a pretty illustration has he given us of the *power* of Catholicism over the heart and intellect!" Thus reflecting, we went to the afternoon service, such as it was. There were a few prayers, a little catechising, or rather a formal repeating of a part of the Catechism by a few children, in presence of a very small congregation. After this came Benediction, with a *minimum* of solemnity in every point. Though I have no knowledge of music, the singing was, even to my ears, poor and disagreeable; and Edith told me afterwards, that to a cultivated taste it was excruciating. Of course nothing could *quite* spoil the

spiritual beauty or destroy the ineffable sweetness of the solemn rite itself, and I trusted that its influence on my father would be good. However, though he seemed serious, he said little or nothing on the subject till the next morning, when, to my extreme surprise, he proposed to prolong our stay at —, for the purpose of seeing a little more of Mr. Smith, to whom he avowed he had taken quite a fancy.

“Thank God!” I cried in my secret heart, as Edith and I gladly acquiesced in the proposal; and for the next week Mr. Smith was our constant visitor. My father incessantly introduced the subject of the Catholic religion, and talked and argued eagerly. To my mind, Smith’s controversial powers were poor in the extreme, and I reflected that, had I myself met with no better a reasoner, I should have remained a Protestant to that very hour. To my father, on the contrary, whose mind was unimpressed with *any* theological creed, the good priest’s simple statements of Catholic doctrine came as a revelation from Almighty God; and I was as much edified as I was struck at perceiving the marvellous power which the truths of Catholicism possessed of making their way direct into the open and candid heart and intelligence, even when recommended by no earthly art or grace. It soon grew clear that, humanly speaking, the period of my father’s conversion was simply a question of time, and so it proved. A visit which he paid to a poor dying man in company with the priest finally determined him; and a fortnight after our arrival at —, we had the unspeakable delight of hearing him make his profession of faith.

Meanwhile the progress of my own thoughts became daily more trying. The contrast between my father’s devout simplicity and my own critical fastidiousness at once humbled and alarmed me. Sudden scruples and spiritual difficulties sprung up and oppressed me. I again grew morbidly self-contemplative, and unhappily I was now far away from my friend Cumberland and his discerning and affectionate advice. I went to confession to Mr. Smith; but he gave me no aid, and seemed scarcely to understand my troubles. “There’s no malice in that,” said he, in reply to my anxious statements of what I fancied might be sins, or a voluntary trifling with the occasions of sins. No doubt he was right, strictly speaking; but the practical result of his rough and undiscerning guidance—or rather of his declining all real guidance—was to throw me back upon myself at the moment when an enlightened spiritual direction was of the first importance.

The evil thus commenced continued to gather force throughout our journeyings, which soon re-commenced. I was pos-

sessed with a passion for comparing my own spiritual state with that of every Catholic I met with, and from every comparison drew fresh materials for self-torment. We had introductions to, or made ourselves acquainted with, Catholics of all classes, and a considerable variety we met with; but every one seemed happier, if not better than I was. Every where, however, the same effects followed. If I became acquainted with persons of great devotion and evident saintliness, I was miserable at my own worldliness. If I came across a coarse, vulgar, every-day sort of Catholic, I was annoyed and shocked. At last my feelings began to take a definite and more torturing shape. The thought struck me,—“Am I following out my right vocation? Are my temptations the result of some fatal original error of which I was guilty after I became a Catholic? Is not my want of devotion, and my anxiety about worldly things, the consequence of my being in a state of life to which God did not intend to call me? What if He had designed me for the monastic or the ecclesiastical state?” The misery of such thoughts may well be imagined, and unfortunately for many months I met with no confessor who was able to relieve my scruples. In some way or other we seemed to stumble upon a series of priests who regarded the life of a person living in the world as necessarily more or less a *worldly* life, in the bad sense of the word. The very idea of a young and rich married man like myself troubling himself about *perfection* was evidently a phenomenon strange to their theology; and the natural consequence was, that whenever I did extract any thing in the shape of definite guidance, it invariably made matters worse than before. My soul could find no *rest*. The more I read on the subject of the importance of finding one's true vocation, the more was I agitated at the recollection of my neglect of all such considerations at the time of my marriage.

Thus situated, it was but natural that my former fancies for anticipating the trials and crosses which God would send me should return in a new and more distressing shape. “There is no cure for me,” I began to imagine, “but losing my dear wife. Such a blow as that must certainly be my portion. Then I *can* turn to the ecclesiastical state, and labour for the souls of this poor, unbelieving people, dying in myriads about me, with no knowledge of the truths that would save them.” I shuddered at my own thoughts; but they clung to me like the horrible imaginations which frighten a timid child. By degrees my health and spirits were visibly affected; and when at last we reached Morley Court, my wife improved in health, and my father full of child-like happiness in his religion, I

had contrived to reduce my own peace to the lowest possible ebb. Cumberland, who called the day after our arrival, instantly remarked the change in my look and manner, and the first time we were alone, asked me the cause with manifest anxiety. I unbosomed myself without a concealment to him, and told him all. He paused when I had done, and then said,

“Why did you not write to me?”

I told him I had thought I could wait till I saw him; and he then continued:

“And I suppose you blame *me* for saying nothing to you about these things immediately after your conversion?”

“Far from it,” I replied; “it never occurred to me that *you* were to blame.”

“But should I *not* have been to blame, if I had seen you, my penitent and friend, resisting the vocation of Almighty God, and had said nothing to you on so momentous and awful a subject?”

“Then why did you say nothing?” I asked.

“Because I saw not the faintest shadow of a sign that you had any vocation to the priesthood; your state and prospects suggested marriage and a position in the world, as your natural duty, unless God gave tokens of his having other destinies for you. But He gave no such tokens. You shewed not the slightest inclination to the ecclesiastical state; you fell in love almost immediately after your conversion. Almighty God by his grace never suggested to you a momentary doubt that you might be doing wrong. In short, to tell you the truth, my dear Morley, a more unfit young gentleman as a candidate for the priesthood—(begging your pardon, of course)—I never saw.”

I felt, and no doubt looked amazed; and he proceeded:

“Depend upon it, Morley, you did perfectly right in marrying; God has blessed your marriage, to your wife, your father, your friends, and (notwithstanding all these temptations) to yourself too. Don’t be afraid. These doubts come from the devil; and I’ll tell you what he wants of you. He wants to get you to abstain from seeking perfection *in* your vocation, from a diseased fancy that you have mistaken that vocation. I know well enough that the married life is a lower one than the monastic and sacerdotal; but what is that to you, when Almighty God has pleased to call you to it? I, whom I trust He *has* called to be a priest, might just as reasonably be cast down because He has made me a man, and not an angel. As to your absurd fancies about your wife’s death and all the rest of it, I charge you, in the most solemn manner, to put them away from you, as you would abstain from a dose of poison.

Rely upon it, they come straight from the devil ; and there is this one proof of it, among plenty of others, that they agitate and torment you, and unfit you for your present duties. Be ever assured, under all circumstances, that the Spirit of God is the spirit of peace, humility, and contentment ; and whenever it pleases Him to give any special guidance to any soul, the *invariable* mark of his presence is the increase of repose and calm faith and love which He sheds upon it. Let me remind you, my dear Morley, of my old warning, ‘Trust God, and distrust yourself.’ You know I always told you that you would be your own worst enemy. Come, tell me, is it not so?”

I confessed the truth of what he said ; and after a little more conversation on the same subject, I made up my mind, and promised him strict obedience to his injunctions. For a time all went well with me ; or rather, I should say, went better, for the same temptations ceased not to harass me more or less for many months afterwards. Increasing as I was in religious knowledge, and sincerely (so far as I could judge) as I obeyed Cumberland’s injunctions, still I was haunted with the fear lest my salvation depended on some great change in my outward circumstances, in my mode of life, or on my taking some extraordinary steps towards the observance of the evangelical counsels. Honestly as I struggled against what I saw clearly to be hindrances to my performance of *undoubted* duties, still the effect—at least temporarily—was injurious and most painful. I never could satisfy myself as to whether I had *consented* to this or that temptation, while in the still disturbed condition of my mind, my imagination remained so morbidly susceptible as to be peculiarly sensitive to those mere *impressions* from the incursion of temptations which it is always so difficult to distinguish from an actual voluntary entertaining of the tempter’s suggestions. My natural cheerfulness of course suffered in proportion, conscious as I was that a gloomy, disheartened condition of mind is most unfavourable to spiritual health. One of the chief consolations was ever this—that I incessantly placed myself unreservedly in the hands of Almighty God, and trusted undoubtedly to the intercession of our Blessed Lady, with a confidence that *in the end* all would be well.

Cumberland never omitted, when I spoke to him on the subject, to warn me against expecting rest from inward warfare so long as life should last, and against expecting any temptation to cease, merely through the change in some external circumstances.

“Your soul, my dear Morley,” he would say, “is in the

hands of God. The moment He thinks fit to set you free from any perplexity, He will do it. Wait on *Him*, and take my word for it, you will find that perhaps when you least expect it, the storms will cease, and the sunshine break forth. No created being *knows* your soul; I, your spiritual director, can only judge of its character superficially; the devil, your enemy, tempts you at hazard, with all his cunning; perhaps you yourself know even less of yourself than either I or your deadly foe; God alone sees you as you are, and just at the moment when it pleases Him, does He console you, or strengthen you, or suffer you to be cast down."

Thus time flowed on, I myself ever striving not to lose heart, and to give myself cheerfully, thankfully, and hopefully to the performance of present duties. I now perceive distinctly what is right, and I *think* I try to do it; but even while I write my story, the same terrible snares beset me, and the desire to know more of myself than God has thought fit to reveal, and to anticipate the coming events and crosses of my life, intrudes itself and clouds my peace. Yet after all I see my path clear for the present hour. In a thankful acquiescence in the presence of this trial is my rest; for it is the will of God that it should attend me *now*, whatever be his will hereafter.

Postscript written by MR. CUMBERLAND.

Who, indeed, can calculate on the coming hour? My poor friend Mr. Morley—than whom a more simple-hearted, devout Catholic scarcely exists—has placed in my hands these paragraphs, the last ever traced by his son. Surely I am not presumptuous in trusting that in their revelations of his struggles, I see the rapid progress of young Basil Morley to a fitness for that tremendous moment which so early brought him into the presence of his God and Judge. Within a week after he wrote the above sentences, his soul was in eternity. A fever, caught we know not how, has made his father childless and his wife a widow. From the moment the illness began, his inward troubles ceased. "Ah! my dear friend," he said to me, when I saw him first after it was known that he could not recover, "the ways of God are not our ways; but I have no will but his will." He had literally no sorrows, except for his wife and his father; but the confidence he expressed in the goodness of Almighty God to console and strengthen them, and in the intercession of Mary and the Saints, was as great as I have ever witnessed. His father and wife are too much stunned to know as yet what they feel; but they recognise the love as well as the power of Him who knows when the

appointed work of each one of his servants is ended, and then takes them away from amongst us; teaching us by this, as by every other manifestation of his power, that we are nothing, that we know nothing, and that the soul has no *rest*, save in uniting her will with his, that she may become what He would have her, whether for a long and active life or a speedy death.

Reviews.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

Letters to a candid Inquirer on Animal Magnetism. By William Gregory, M.D. F.R.S.E., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh. London, Taylor and Walton.

It is now three quarters of a century since a German physician, by name Anton Mesmer, on the occasion of his admittance to the degree of doctor of medicine in the University of Vienna, published an inaugural thesis on the influence of the planets on the human body. This was the first public announcement (at least in modern times) of a belief in the existence of what is now called Animal Magnetism, or Mesmerism, or, by a still later phrase, adapted to one section of its phenomena, Electro-biology.

During this period animal magnetism has encountered the severest storms of ridicule, argument, denunciation, and condemnation which ever assailed a nascent opinion. Trodden down in one place, it has sprung up in another; abhorred by many Christians because advocated by certain infidels and atheists, it has won its converts from among its most contemptuous opponents; attributed by one person to the devil, by another to imposture, by another to transparent folly; still it lives, and prospers, and gains advocates from men of almost every rank and class of mind, and in every civilised country.

To shut our eyes, therefore, to its existence, or treat it as a thing fit only for the thoughts of knaves or dreamers, is no longer possible. Whether true or false, the believers in its reality have become so numerous and so respectable, and the kind of evidence which they put before us is so singularly manifold, and to all appearance so irrefragable, that it has become almost a matter of duty to inform ourselves of the details of a subject, possessing—we do not hesitate to say—an interest of a character nothing less than *fearful*. As Catholics,

moreover, we cannot forget that the proper ecclesiastical authority has been more than once definitely consulted in the matter; and that therefore it is well that we should know how far it is lawful for us to be in any way concerned in practices which possess all that terrible fascination which, in other ages, tempted so many to the unhallowed devices of sorcery and witchcraft. A very satisfactory text-book from which to gather the necessary information has just been sent forth by the Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh; and from Dr. Gregory's pages we shall draw at sufficient length to enable our readers to form some idea of what animal magnetism professes to do with those who become subjected to its influence. Dr. Gregory's position is such, and the character of the many persons to whom he repeatedly refers by name is also such, that it is beyond the limits of possibility that he should be consciously the vehicle of an imposture; while it is almost equally difficult to imagine that, in a vast number of the cases referred to, any thing like deception could be practicable. We do not undertake, however, to express any opinion of our own on the subject. We merely repeat Dr. Gregory's statements, premising that similar statements are made by hundreds and hundreds of other persons, many of them of undeniable acuteness and unimpeachable veracity. For ourselves, we should state that, personally, we have never witnessed any of the mesmeric phenomena; but at the same time we have received many accurate details from various friends (Catholic as well as Protestant) which precisely fall in with the accounts published by Dr. Gregory and the many other believers in the science (so called) of animal magnetism.

Dr. Gregory himself, so far as his character may be judged from his book, is very far from sharing the sceptical views of some of the most notorious mesmerists. He is a Scotch Protestant, but he seems to have a sincere though not very accurately defined belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and in the reality of the Christian miracles. He also declares himself to be alive to the paramount authority of the moral law of Almighty God as the *only* standard by which our actions are to be guided; and there is nothing in his book which would justify us in imputing insincerity to him in his declarations. That he should shew himself incredibly blind to the one *great* moral objection to the practice of mesmerism, is but the result of the defective morality of Protestantism: and we must do him the justice to say, that (so far as we know) his blindness on this point is shared by every other Protestant who has come forward whether as an advocate or an opponent of the science. It need scarcely perhaps be added, that Dr. Gregory has

omitted to inquire *what* the authorities of the Catholic Church have really decreed on the subject, and that he has no scruple in attributing to her that which is not true, on the merest popular report of her ignorant enemies. With these drawbacks our readers will find in Dr. Gregory's volume a calm and dispassionate outline of the arguments in favour of the reality of animal magnetism, with an able discussion of the objections of its adversaries, and a repertory of facts of the most ample variety and the most astounding character. It will of course be impossible for us to give any thing more than a brief sketch of the more striking phenomena for whose truth Dr. Gregory vouches; and for the rest we must refer the curious inquirer to his book. Having done this, we shall lay before our readers the decrees which have been judicially promulgated by the competent Catholic authorities in condemnation of certain mesmeric practices, together with one or two considerations which will justify these decrees in the eyes of every person of unbiassed moral sense.

The mesmeric theory, then, asserts that it is possible by artificial means to induce in many, if not in all persons, a species of sleep corresponding to what is commonly called somnambulism. In this condition the sleeper possesses extraordinary powers, which enable him not only to dispense with the ordinary instrumentality of the senses, but to work results to which the natural senses in their waking state are totally incompetent. *What* is the precise nature of the instrument by which the magnetised patient thus works, the advocates of the theory do not pretend to say, except that they maintain that it is a purely *natural* means, and neither satanic nor in any sense supernatural. With perfect justice they allege, that this inability to explain the nature of magnetism (as it is called) furnishes no ground for disbelieving its palpable *effects*. In reality, we know little or nothing of the real nature of *any* natural agents. *What* is electricity? *What* is the attraction of gravity? *What* is animal and vegetable life itself? No human intelligence can tell. *How* it is that by an act of volition I can lift my hand, is in truth as unfathomable a mystery as that a magnetised person should perceive what is taking place on the other side of a brick wall. It is familiarity alone which causes us to be unimpressed with the awfully incomprehensible character of *every thing* that is around and within us.

The mode in which this magnetic sleep is produced is thus described by Dr. Gregory :

“ If you will try the experiment of drawing the points of the fingers of your right hand, without contact but very near, over the

hands of several persons, downwards from the wrist, the hands being held with the palms upwards, and your fingers either all abreast, or one following the other, and repeat this, slowly, several times, you will most probably find one or more who distinctly perceive a peculiar sensation, which is not always the same in different persons. Some will feel a slight warmth, others a slight coolness, others a pricking; some a tingling, others a numbness. Such as perceive these sensations most distinctly may then be tested, and will be found, probably, very clear and consistent with themselves, even if blindfolded. But sometimes blindfolding produces at once a state of nervous disturbance, most unfavourable to clear perception. All this I have often tried and seen; and Reichenbach, as well as many others, has minutely described it.

“You may now, having found a person susceptible to a certain extent, proceed to try the effect of passes, made slowly with both your hands, downwards from the crown of the patient’s head, over the face, to the pit of the stomach, or even down to the feet, always avoiding contact, but keeping as near as possible without contact. Or you may make the passes laterally, and so downwards over the arms. It is necessary to act with a cool, collected mind, and a firm will, while the patient is perfectly passive and undisturbed by noise or otherwise. He ought to look steadily at the eyes of the operator, who, in his turn, ought to gaze firmly on his subject. The passes should be continued, patiently, for some time, and will generally excite the sensations above mentioned, warmth, coolness, pricking, tingling, creeping of the skin, or numbness, according to the individual operated on. When these sensations are very marked, the subject will, in all probability, turn out a good one. It is probable that, with patience and perseverance, a vigorous, healthy operator would finally succeed in affecting all persons; but in some cases, which have afterwards become very susceptible, the subjects have been only affected with great difficulty, and only after much perseverance, or even have not been at all affected on the first trial, nay even for many successive trials. The operator must not be discouraged. If he perseveres, the chances of success are much increased, while he will often meet with cases in which a few minutes suffice to produce strong effects.

“Another, and in some cases a more successful method, is to sit down close before the patient, to take hold of his thumbs in your thumbs and fingers, and, gently pressing them, to gaze fixedly in his eyes, concentrating your mind upon him, while he does the same. This is, at least in the beginning, less fatiguing than making the accustomed motions of passes, although, with a little practice, it is easier to make several hundreds of passes uninterruptedly. I cannot give decided preference to either method. Both will occasionally fail, and both are often successful. They may be combined, that is, alternated, and often with advantage.

“Two things are desirable. First, a passive and willing state of mind in the patient, although faith in magnetism is not at all indis-

pensable; but a *bona fide* passivity, or willingness to be acted on. This, however, signifies little in susceptible cases. Secondly, intense concentration on the part of the operator. It is self-evident that, to attain this, perfect silence is essential. Even the noises in the street will often distract both parties from the necessary attention, and still more, whispering among the company, moving about, the rustling of a lady's dress, &c. &c. The time required varies from a minute or two to an hour or more, but usually diminishes on repetition.

"Intent gazing alone, especially if practised by both parties, will often produce the sensations above described, without close proximity. I have often seen Mr. Lewis, who likes this mode of operating, namely, gazing at a certain distance, with intensity and a firm volition, produce these sensations, and even stronger effects, in the space of five minutes, on a considerable proportion of the company, varying perhaps from 5 to 20 or 25 per cent, according to circumstances. But his power of concentration is truly astonishing, and is strongly indicated in his whole gesture, and in the expression of his countenance, while operating.

"Lastly, these sensations may be produced by gazing, on the part of the patient alone, either at a small object in his hand, as practised by Dr. Darling with great success, or at an object placed above and before the eyes, as is done with equal success by Mr. Braid in producing hypnotism. Indeed, one difficulty in these cases is, to prevent the subject from going further, and becoming unconscious.

"Such is a general account of the phenomena which first present themselves, which are not very striking, and of the processes usually followed. Indeed many are ready to say, that these phenomena are due only to the silence and constraint of the experiment, and therefore prove nothing. But such a remark only applies to the faintest sensations. When strongly marked, they are quite unmistakable, and cannot, by any possibility, be ascribed to any thing but a real influence, which, according to the form of experiment, may be either external or internal.

"Now, the same processes, when continued longer, give rise to phenomena still more striking; and I shall now proceed to these, while it will be unnecessary to repeat the detail of the processes, which, as already described, suffice to produce the whole train of magnetic phenomena.

"The first is, a twitching of the eyelids, which begin to droop, while, even when the eyelids remain open, there is in many cases a veil, as it were, drawn before the eyes, concealing the operator's face and other objects. Now, also, comes on a drowsiness, and, after a time, consciousness is suddenly lost; and on awaking, the patient has no idea whatever how long it is since he fell asleep, nor what has occurred during his sleep. The whole is a blank; but he generally wakes, with a deep sigh, rather suddenly, and says he has had a very pleasant sleep, without the least idea whether for five minutes or for five hours."

The phenomena of this state are the following, as given by Dr. Gregory:

“ 1. It is a state of somnambulism, sleep-walking, or more correctly sleep-waking. It is a sound, calm, undisturbed sleep; that is, it is not broken by gleams of ordinary consciousness. But the sleeper answers when spoken to by the operator, and answers rationally and sensibly. He frequently doubts, and therefore frequently uses the words, ‘ I don’t know,’ and appears most anxious not to affirm or deny any thing of which he is not quite sure. If desired, he will rise and walk; and according to the particular stage in which he may be, he walks with more or less confidence and security, his eyes being always closed, or, if found open, either turned up or insensible to light. In short, he is a somnambulist, and possesses some means, not possessed in the ordinary state, of becoming aware of the presence of objects.”

2. The sleeper sometimes hears with marvellously increased acuteness. “ Many cases of sleep-walking are recorded in which no sound, however loud, was heard by the somnambulist, and some in which very loud noises suddenly and dangerously awoke him, whereas less loud sounds had not been noticed. The state of utter deafness to all sounds, however loud, such as shouting or firing a pistol, or ringing a large bell, close to the ear, is very common in the magnetic sleep, and may be produced in every case at some stage of it, or, by the will of the operator, at almost any stage.

“ 3. When the sleeper (says Dr. Gregory) has become fully asleep, so as to answer questions readily without waking, there is almost always observed a remarkable change in the countenance, the manner, and the voice. On falling asleep at first, he looks perhaps drowsy and heavy, like a person dozing in church, or at table, when overcome by fatigue, or stupefied by excess in wine, or by the foul air of a crowded apartment. But when spoken to, he usually brightens up; and although the eyes be closed, yet the expression becomes highly intelligent, quite as much so as if he saw. His whole manner seems to undergo a refinement, which in the higher stages, reaches a most striking point, insomuch that we see, as it were, before us a person of a much more elevated character than the same sleeper seems to be when awake. It would seem as if the lower or animal propensities were laid to rest, while the intellect and higher sentiments shone forth with a lustre that is undiminished by aught that is mean or common. This is particularly seen in women of natural refinement and high sentiments, but it is also observed in men of the same stamp, and more or less in all. In the highest

stages of the magnetic sleep, the countenance often acquires the most lovely expression, surpassing all that the greatest artists have given to the Virgin Mary, or to Angels, and which may fitly be called heavenly, for it involuntarily suggests to our minds the moral and intellectual beauty which alone seems consistent with our views of heaven. As to the voice, I have never seen one person in the true magnetic sleep who did not speak in a tone quite distinct from the ordinary voice of the sleeper. It is invariably, so far as I have observed, softer and more gentle, well corresponding to the elevated and mild expression of the face. It has often a plaintive and touching character, especially when the sleeper speaks of departed friends or relations. In the highest stages, it has a character quite new, and in perfect accordance with the pure and lovely smile of the countenance, which beams on the observer, in spite of the closed eyes, like a ray of heaven's own light and beauty. I speak here of that which I have often seen, and I would say that, as a general rule, the sleeper, when in his ordinary state, and when in the deep magnetic sleep, appears not like the same, but like two different individuals."

4. The sleeper has a consciousness distinct from his ordinary consciousness, generally, *but not always*, forgetting when awake what took place during his sleep.

" 5. The sleeper, with closed eyes, yet often speaks as if he saw certain objects, when his attention is directed to them. He even makes an apparent effort to see, or to look at them, while his eyes are only more firmly closed. But he very often feels them in his hand; and whether by the acuteness of his touch, or by some other means, describes them as if he saw them. Or he places them on his forehead, on the summit of his head, or on the occiput, or on the epigastrium, and then describes them, which perhaps he could not do when they were held by the operator before his closed eyes. He talks of seeing them, and evidently makes an exertion to apply his internal or cerebral vision to their examination. In this he often succeeds, but often also finds great difficulty, especially in the earlier stages of the sleep. In fact, we have here the dawning of clairvoyance, which only reaches its noon-day brightness in the highest stage of the sleep. In the stage to which at present our remarks are confined, the object must be in some way in contact with, or at least very close to, the sleeper; he is incapable otherwise of describing it."

6. The sleeper is very often deaf to every sound, save the voice of the operator. "I have seen subjects (says Dr. Gregory) who readily heard and answered every question addressed to them by any of the persons present, without

being in contact with them, or being purposely placed *en rapport* with them. In some of these cases, the subjects, either spontaneously, or at the will of the operator, or by passes, &c. made by him, pass into a higher state, and then instantly become deaf to all sounds, except his voice. Nay, I have seen and examined one very remarkable case, in which the sleeper, when she had passed spontaneously into a higher state of lucidity, became deaf even to the operator's voice, unless he spoke to her through the tips of her fingers, holding his mouth, while speaking, so as to touch them. When this was done she started, and, after a moment, answered questions thus put as readily as before. You might bellow in her ear, or fire off a pistol, without her countenance indicating the slightest change, or without her ceasing for an instant to dwell on and describe what she was engaged in looking at, which she readily did without questions being asked at all. Any one else could converse with this subject in the same way, and I did so for an hour or two.

"7. The sleeper often becomes entirely insensible to pain; that is, he is rendered insensible to impressions of touch and other forms of feeling, as he was before to sounds. In many cases, where this does not spontaneously happen, but not in all, it may be effected by the will, expressed or silent, of the operator. Many persons who produce the sleep are not aware of this, and hence imagine that their subjects cannot be rendered insensible to pain.

"8. The sleeper is usually very much under the control of the operator in reference to the duration of the sleep. The operator may fix any time, long or short, and if the sleeper promise to sleep for that period, he will do so to a second. He then wakes up, and is instantly quite free from all effect, without any further process. . . . But if no time be fixed by the operator, the sleeper awakes spontaneously, after a longer or shorter interval, generally from half an hour to two hours, at least in the cases I have seen. Sometimes, and especially if urged with many questions requiring exertion to answer, the sleeper declares that he is fatigued, and begs to be awakened.

"9. Whether the time of sleeping be fixed by the operator, or left to nature, the sleeper, in a large number of cases, can tell when asked, and generally very readily, precisely how long he has to sleep; and if he be repeatedly asked at different times, he will always be found correct as to the time still remaining.

"10. The sleeper, often when he is first put to sleep, and still oftener after several times, will answer a variety of ques-

tions as to the best and most effectual method of magnetising him, whether by passes or otherwise; as to the powers which he will hereafter possess; and as to the time when he shall acquire those powers, or exhibit certain phenomena.

“ 11. Although the sleeper, in general, has no recollection when awake of what has passed in the sleep, this is far from being an uniform occurrence. Some remember a part, others the whole, of what has taken place. But even in many of those cases in which there is, naturally, no remembrance of it, the operator, if he choose, may command his subject, during the sleep, to remember a part or the whole of what has occurred, which will then be remembered accordingly.

“ 12. That the subject, while asleep, may be made to forget any thing that he would otherwise remember, by the will of the operator. He may be made to forget, not only what has happened in the former sleeps, but even that he has ever slept, or been magnetised before. He often forgets spontaneously his own name, and if not, can be made to do so. This is another proof of the control exercised by the magnetiser on his subject.

“ 13. This control is further shewn by the power which the operator has of producing in the sleeper inability to move the arm or leg, to speak, to rise up or to sit down, by his will. It is shewn in the production of partial or general cataleptic rigidity and its removal. It is shewn, in short, in the complete command of all the voluntary muscles of the subject acquired by the operator.

“ 14. It further appears in the power of causing the sleeper instantaneously to imitate, with the most perfect and admirable mimicry, every gesture of the operator, and every tone of his voice. If the magnetiser speaks German or Italian, languages perhaps quite unknown to the subject, and with the greatest rapidity, the sleeper will speak after him so exactly, that it is often impossible, when his ear is acute in catching the minute shades of sound, to perceive the slightest difference. If the magnetiser laughs, he instantly laughs; if the former makes any gesture, however ridiculous, the latter imitates it exactly, and all this with closed eyes, and when the operator is behind him, so that he cannot be seen. The same subject when awake, will often, indeed generally, be found to fail miserably in his attempts at this instantaneous mimicry, and indeed to fail even when he takes more time to it.

“ 15. The sleeper, if naturally insensible to the voice or to the actions of all but his magnetiser, may be put *en rapport* with any other person. This may be done by simply giving him the person's hand, in many cases. In others, the sleeper

requires to be told to communicate with that person, and this having been done, he becomes as completely and exclusively *en rapport* with him as he before was with the magnetiser. It often happens, that the stranger thus placed *en rapport* with the subject, must again retransfer him to the magnetiser, before the latter can communicate with him. The transference from one to another, in such cases, is usually attended with a start on the part of the sleeper, but he does not awake.

“16. All the feelings, propensities, and talents of the sleeper may be excited to action by the magnetiser, and that in various ways, either by merely touching the corresponding parts of the head, as in what is called phreno-mesmerism, to be hereafter considered, or, as comes naturally to be considered in this place, by the expressed will of the operator.

“The subject may be rendered happy and gay, or sad and dejected; angry, or pleased; liberal, or stingy; proud, or vain; pugnacious, or pacific; bold, or timid; hopeful, or despondent; insolent, or respectful, &c. &c. He may be made to sing, to spout, to laugh, to weep, to act, to dance, to shoot, to fish, to preach, to pray, to deliver an eloquent oration, or to excogitate a profound argument.”

17. The sleeper is usually peculiarly sensitive to the effects of music, and much more so than in his ordinary state.

“18. Not only are the attitudes and gesture, the tone of voice and the expression of the face, true to nature, in the expression of every feeling that is excited, but this truthfulness extends to all that is said by the sleeper. As a general, perhaps invariable rule, he refuses, whatever questions may be asked, or suggestions made, to go beyond what he feels sure of, in describing his own sensations, or his visions, if we call them so. The spectator often unconsciously does his best to mislead him by leading questions, and also by such as arise from a misconception of his meaning. Yet of all things observed in the sleep, that which most constantly recurs, and most forcibly strikes us, is the frequent repetition of the words, ‘I don’t know exactly;’ ‘I cannot say for certain;’ ‘I cannot see whether it is so or not;’ ‘I must not say what I do not see, or feel, or know,’ and the like; while, when the sleeper once sees, feels, or knows a thing, he adheres firmly to it.”

19. After once producing the sleep on a subject, the operator can produce it afterwards with much greater ease on the same person, at times being able to cause its instantaneous production by the mere act of his will, even at a great distance. Of this phenomenon, Dr. Gregory gives the following instance:

"Mr. Lewis met a party of fifty ladies and gentlemen in my house, one evening in the end of November or beginning of December 1850. He acted on the company *en masse*, and affected several, among them a lady, a member of my family, who was susceptible, and had frequently been magnetised by others. This lady, when magnetised, loses the power of her arms, her eyes are closed, and the sensations she experiences are very marked and well known to her. Mr. Lewis, not being told how strongly she had been affected by him, did not do any thing to remove the effect, and the consequence was a headache, to which she is naturally very subject. This she ascribed to her not having been demagnetised, and it continued next morning. When I saw Mr. Lewis, after my lecture, at 11 A.M., he asked me how the lady was. I mentioned the headache, as well as her idea of the cause of it. Mr. Lewis then said, 'Oh, never mind the headache. I shall think of her sometime during the day, and dismiss her headache.' This I begged him to do, as I knew that such things could be done. He then left me. When I returned home, at 5 P.M., I had quite forgotten this conversation, when the lady in question recalled it by saying, as I entered the room, 'What do you think of this? I have been magnetised in your absence.' 'Indeed! by whom?' 'By nobody. I was sitting at the pianoforte playing, at half-past three, when I felt as if strongly magnetised; my arms lost their power; I could no longer play, and had all the usual sensations. In a few minutes I was compelled to lie down on the sofa, and fell into a short magnetic sleep. When I woke, my headache was quite gone.' 'Did you mention this to any one at the time?' 'I was alone; but, just as I woke, a lady, who was here last night, called, and I told her of it, adding, that I felt sure that Mr. Lewis was magnetising me.' I then said that he had undertaken to do so, but that I did not know whether he had done it or not. In the evening I saw Mr. Lewis again, at a large party, and, in the presence of Dr. W. F. Cumming, who felt much interested in the case, I asked him whether he had kept his promise about the lady's headache. He said he had. Dr. Cumming then asked him at what time, when he at once answered, 'At half-past three, when I returned to my lodgings. I could not do it sooner.'

"It appears to me that every thing was here combined to make the case a good one. It was accidental. The subject had no idea either that she was to be magnetised, nor of the time; and a lady came opportunely to attest the fact before my return, while a gentleman heard Mr. Lewis' answers to my questions and his own. I may add, that the lodgings of Mr. Lewis are in South St. Andrew Street, while my house is at 114 Prince's Street, a distance of nearly four divisions of Prince's Street, or, I should suppose, 500 or 600 yards. I may further state, that on two other occasions, Mr. Lewis affected the same lady, at the same and at a greater distance, without her knowing that he was to do so."

We may here add, that we ourselves know of a precisely

similar case, in which the operator was the wife of a gentleman whose name is well known to all our readers, and who, with his wife, has since become a Catholic.

20. "Not only may (says Dr. Gregory) the subject be put to sleep by the silent will, but he may be made, also by the silent will, to exhibit all the phenomena already described as producible by the expressed volition of the operator. He may be made, in this way, to come to the operator, or to sit down in any place, or to perform any act, which the magnetiser may will him to do. It is unnecessary here to repeat details; it suffices to say, that, in many cases, every thing that can be done by the expressed will, may be done also by the silent will, of the latter. This, too, occurs also in the conscious state.

21. "Another remarkable fact, is a kind of attraction felt towards the magnetiser, and which he, by willing, can exert in many cases. The subject then feels an irresistible desire to approach him, and if prevented will exert great force to overcome the obstacle. He cannot explain it farther than by saying that he is drawn somehow towards him; some, however, speak of fine filaments or threads, often luminous, by which they are gently drawn to him. This strange attraction may also be exhibited at a distance. I have been informed, on the best authority, of a case where it was exerted at the distance of 100 yards or more, and where the subject moved towards the operator, till stopped by the wall of the house in which she was, in spite of the resistance offered by a strong man. This may also be shewn in the conscious state.

22. "In some cases, there is observed a permanent liking for the magnetiser, in the ordinary waking state of the subject. I have not had opportunities of seeing this; but it is, I believe, a well-authenticated fact.

23. "This leads me to another very curious phenomenon, namely, that the sleeper, if commanded, in the sleep, to do a certain thing, after waking, and at a certain hour, will do so, and however absurd or ridiculous the act, he cannot, in many cases, refrain from doing it, if he has promised it in the sleep. He may have been ordered to go to a certain person's house at a certain hour, and ask some trifling or useless question. As the time approaches, he is seen to be restless, till he sets out for his destination. He pays no attention to the people he may meet, and if they purposely arrest him, he forces his way onwards, asks his question, and can only say, that he felt that he *must* do so. He is often much hurt at the ridicule excited by his action, and therefore should not be made to

do any thing that may excite ridicule, as, if that be persevered in, he will refuse compliance with the order or request, when made. This, at least, often happens.

“ This power, of influencing the waking actions by a promise made in the sleep, may be most usefully applied. I lately saw a person, who had been induced by Mr. Lewis to promise, while in the sleep, to abstain from fermented liquors, and had, in his ordinary state, steadily adhered to that promise, ever since it was made, three or four months before; nor had he the slightest desire to break it. I do not know whether he was aware of having made the promise, but that is not at all essential. The desire is extinguished, even when the subject has no recollection of the promise, and has not been told of it in his waking state. Mr. Lewis informs me that he has broken many persons off the habit of drinking, as well as of other bad habits in this way. From what I have seen, I am satisfied that a pledge given in the magnetic sleep will be found more binding than one given in the ordinary waking state.”

Such are the chief of what are called the lower phenomena of the magnetic sleep. In comparison with the higher phenomena they seem everyday trifles. These latter are defined as of two classes, viz. sympathy and clairvoyance. In the cases of sympathy, the sleeper acquires the power of perceiving every sensation, bodily and mental, of his magnetiser. Thus, there is produced a community of taste. “ If the operator, or other person *en rapport* with the subject, takes any kind of food or drink into his mouth, the sleeper, in many cases, instantly begins going through the pantomime of eating or drinking; and if asked, he declares he is eating bread, or an orange, or sweetmeats, or drinking water, wine, milk, beer, syrup, or lemonade, or infusion of wormwood, or brandy, or whisky, according as the operator takes each of them, or any other substance. When the thing taken is bitter or disagreeable, the countenance of the sleeper at once indicates this, while his eyes, as usual, are closed, and the magnetiser or friend may stand behind him, so that he cannot see what is taken.” The same results take place in the action of the senses of smell and touch. With respect to the sight and the hearing Dr. Gregory hesitates to pronounce.

Between the conditions of clairvoyance and sympathy there exists a species of compound state, termed sympathetic clairvoyance, or thought-reading.

“ Thought-reading (as Dr. Gregory describes it) presents itself in every possible variety of form. The sleeper, being placed *en rapport* with any person, can often describe, with the greatest ac-

curacy, the subject that occupies the thoughts of that person. It may be an absent friend, or his own house, or that of another, or his drawing-room, bed-room, study, &c. &c. All these things the sleeper perceives, as they pass through the mind of the experimenter, and describes with great minuteness and accuracy, so as to excite our astonishment. Or he goes further; he not only perceives the present, but the past thoughts of the person *en rapport* with him; he shares his memory. Thus he will mention facts, no longer so existing, but remembered by the experimenter. Nay, he goes still further even than this; for he perceives things once known to, and now forgotten by, the experimenter, who very often contradicts the sleeper, and persists in maintaining his own opinion, until, on further inquiry, he not only finds him to be right, but himself is enabled to recal the fact, which had, as we say, escaped his memory. We all know that we are apt, at times, to forget facts, which subsequently recur to the memory. But here, it would seem that the sleeper so sympathises with our past thoughts, as to read what we ourselves are for the moment blind to. At least, this must be admitted by those who ascribe all clairvoyance to sympathy; but it is difficult, in many cases, to distinguish between sympathetic and direct clairvoyance, if we admit the possibility of the latter. For example, the sleeper describes a room, at the request of the experimenter. He details the form, size, doors, windows, book-cases, tables, carpet, fireplace, sofas, chairs, pianoforte, &c. &c., and, as he goes on, every statement is confirmed by the proprietor, who sees the whole in his mind's eye, as when he left it. But all at once, perhaps, the sleeper speaks of the hangings, or pictures, and says he sees the picture of a dog, a horse, or a man, in such or such a position, with reference to another object. This is denied; but the sleeper is firm. So is the other, and after a long dispute, each retains his opinion. But on returning home, the experimenter finds that he has been mistaken, and the sleeper right. He now remembers, that up to a certain period, the picture hung where he had said, but that he himself, or some one else, had changed its position to that described by the sleeper, as he himself formerly knew, but had forgotten. Similar occurrences are very common. . . .

“One frequent form of thought-reading is that of perceiving the contents of a closed letter, or of a sealed packet, or of a sealed box. Some sleepers can do this readily, if *en rapport* with a person who knows these contents, but not otherwise. But here it must be noted, that, in some cases, the *rapport* is established without contact, so that it suffices for the sleeper, that one person who knows the contents of the closed objects should be present. And lastly, it appears that some subjects, who at one time possess the power of direct or immediate clairvoyance, at other times are destitute of this, and have only that of thought-reading.”

The powers of direct clairvoyance are more marvellous still. The sleeper sees objects of every kind, before him,

behind him, hidden in persons' hands, shut up in boxes, on the other side of house-walls, in houses far distant, even to the other side of the Atlantic ocean. He visits in mind distant places, and describes every thing that is going on there. He can see events long past, and describe the details of the history of persons long dead. He can look into his own body and into the bodies of others, and describes with the utmost minuteness their anatomical structure. In addition to these powers, it is asserted by some persons that the clairvoyant state occasionally enables persons to foretell future events. Dr. Gregory admits that he has never himself known an instance of the kind, except such as were immediately and *organically* connected with the present condition of the subject of the prophecy.

Lastly, it is stated that the magnetic influence is exerted not merely by one person over another, but by magnets, by certain crystals, by the moon, by electricity, and perhaps by every substance in nature. It is also said that a faint light is frequently *visible*, emanating from the magnetising body, whether an inanimate object or the hand of an operator.

We proceed to give a few of the very numerous cases cited by Dr. Gregory.

The first shews the effects of suggestion in the conscious state, in which the patient remains awake, but changes his sensations, and has his various powers absolutely controlled at the will of the operator.

"In a large party at my house (says Dr. Gregory), Mr. Lewis acted on the company *en masse*, standing at one end of the room, while all present were requested to gaze at him, or at any fixed point in the same direction, and to keep themselves in as passive a state as possible. Mr. Lewis gazed on the company, beginning at one end of the circle of fifty persons, and slowly carrying his gaze round, with the most intense concentration I have ever seen, as expressed in his face, attitude, and gesture. In much less than five minutes, although the necessary silence was but partially observed, several persons were distinctly affected. Among these, Mr. D., a student of medicine, very soon appeared to be the most susceptible. Mr. Lewis, observing this, directed his attention more particularly to him, and made a few distant passes, gradually approaching Mr. D. The latter bent forward with fixed insensible eyes and heaving respiration, and seemed to be attracted towards the operator. It soon appeared, however, that he was so rigid as not to be able to move forward, although he evidently tried to do so. Mr. Lewis then came near, and, by a pass or two, stopped the laborious respirations, and removed the general rigidity, when the eyes became natural. Mr. D. was then made to close his eyes, and on being told he could not open them, he found it impossible to do

so. His mouth being closed, he was then told he could not open it, nor speak, and this also he found impossible. His right arm being raised, Mr. Lewis, who had not touched him, told him that he could not lower it, which proved to be the case. It very soon became hard, rigid, and immovable, and was held out horizontally for a long time. In fact, a pass or two, over any limb, rendered it instantly rigid. Mr. Lewis then desired Mr. D. to gaze at him for a second or two, he gazing in return; when the eyes at once became fixed, the pupil dilated, and utterly insensible, so that no contraction ensued when a candle was passed close across the eye, or held close before it. The pulse being 76, Mr. Lewis pointed with one hand over the heart, while a medical man felt the pulse. It rapidly rose to 150, and became so feeble as hardly to be felt, while the patient became pale, and would certainly have fainted, had this experiment been continued a minute longer. Mr. Lewis then caused both the arms and legs of the patient successively to move, in spite of all the efforts of the patient, according as he, Mr. L., chose to direct them. They first moved to a certain extent, and then became rigid, and all this without contact. When his hand was laid on that of Mr. L., and he was defied to remove it, he found it quite impossible to do so.

“ Mr. Lewis, having thus shewn his control over the muscles both voluntary and involuntary, next shewed his power of controlling sensation. A penknife being placed in Mr. D.’s hand, he was told that it would soon become so hot that he could not hold it. Within about two minutes he began to shift it from one part of the hand to another, and soon threw it away as if it had been red-hot. The knife was again placed in his hand, and he was told that it would become so heavy as to force his hand down to the floor. He very soon began to make efforts to keep it up, but in about three or four minutes, in spite of the most violent resistance, which caused him to be bathed in perspiration, and to be out of breath, his hand was forced down to the floor.

“ Mr. Lewis next caused Mr. D. to forget his own name, and the perplexity of his countenance, while seeking for it in vain, was very striking. In this, as in all the other experiments, the effect was instantaneously dissipated by a snap of Mr. L.’s fingers, or by the words, ‘ All right.’ ”

The next extract refers to what is called direct clairvoyance in the waking state. Dr. Gregory is quoting from the accounts given to him by the operator, Major Buckley.

“ Major Buckley first ascertains whether his subjects are susceptible, by making with his hands passes above and below their hands, from the wrist downwards. If certain sensations, such as tingling, numbness, &c. are strongly felt, he knows that he will be able to produce the magnetic sleep. But to ascertain whether he can obtain conscious clairvoyance, he makes slow passes from his own forehead to his own chest. If this produce a blue light in his

face, strongly visible, the subject will probably acquire conscious clairvoyance. If not, or if the light be pale, the subject must first be rendered clairvoyant in the sleep. Taking those subjects who see a very deep blue light, he continues to make passes over his own face, and also over the object, a box or a nut, for example, in which written or printed words are enclosed, which the clairvoyant is to read. Some subjects require only a pass or two to be made, others require many. They describe the blue light as rendering the box or nut transparent, so that they can read what is inside. (This reminds us of the curious fact mentioned by Reichenbach, that bars of iron or steel, seen by conscious sensitives, without any passes, shining in the dark with the odylie glow, appeared to them transparent like glass.) If too many passes be made by Major B., the blue light becomes so deep that they cannot read, and some reverse passes must be made, to render the light less deep. Major Buckley has thus produced conscious clairvoyance in 89 persons, of whom 44 have been able to read mottoes contained in nut-shells, purchased by other parties for the experiment. The longest motto thus read contained 98 words. Many subjects will read motto after motto without one mistake. In this way, the mottoes contained in 4860 nut-shells have been read; some of them, indeed, by persons in the mesmeric sleep, but most of them by persons in the conscious state, many of whom have never been put to sleep. In boxes, upwards of 36,000 words have been read; in one paper, 371 words. Including those who have read words contained in boxes when in the sleep, 148 persons have thus read. It is to be observed that, in a few cases, the words may have been read by thought-reading, as the persons who put them in the boxes were present; but in most cases, no one who knew the words has been present, and they must therefore have been read by direct clairvoyance. Every precaution has been taken. The nuts, enclosing mottoes, for example, have been purchased of 40 different confectioners, and have been sealed up until read. It may be added, that of the 44 persons who have read mottoes in nuts by waking or conscious clairvoyance, 42 belong to the higher class of society; and the experiments have been made in the presence of many other persons. These experiments appear to me admirably contrived, and I can perceive no reason whatever to doubt the entire accuracy of the facts. It would of course be tedious to enumerate so many experiments, all of the same kind; but I shall select one or two of the most striking as examples.

“Case 9.—Sir T. Willshire took home with him a nest of boxes belonging to Major Buckley, and placed in the inner box a slip of paper, on which he had written a word. Some days later he brought back the boxes, sealed up in paper, and asked one of Major Buckley’s clairvoyantes to read the word. Major B. made passes over the boxes, when she said she saw the word ‘concert.’ Sir T. Willshire declared that she was right as to the first and last letters, but that the word was different. She persisted, when he told her that

the word was 'correct.' But on opening the boxes, the word proved to be 'concert.' This case is very remarkable; for had the clairvoyante read the word by thought-reading, she would have read it according to the belief of Sir T. Willshire, who had either intended to write 'correct,' or in the interval, forgot that he had written 'concert,' but certainly believed the former to be the word."

It is well known that in past times it was supposed that certain persons possessed a power of describing distant occurrences by means of divination through the aid of "magic crystals" or "magic mirrors." Modern mesmerism asserts that these were mere cases of *conscious clairvoyance*, acquired by gazing steadily at some peculiar object. The following is one of Dr. Gregory's instances of the reality of this power, seen by himself and tested by himself:

"The crystal of which I speak is of the size and shape of a large turkey's egg, and was sold some years since by a dealer in curiosities as an old magic crystal, with a paper containing certain mystical and magical rules for its use. In the few experiments I shall mention, it was used by simply desiring the person to gaze earnestly at it.

"Case 13.—A boy, quite ignorant of what was expected, after gazing at the crystal for about half an hour very steadily, saw a dark cloud appear in it, which soon cleared up, and he then saw his mother in her room. By and by, his father appeared. I then asked him to look for a lady, whom he saw walking in the street in which she lived, and actually described her walking dress, which he had never seen, although he may have seen the lady for a moment in the evening. I then asked for a boy and a servant whom I was sure he had never seen. He saw and described most accurately the persons and dress of both. I asked for another servant, whom he saw opening the street-door to admit the lady. I marked the time, and found that this lady had been walking in the dress described, and had entered her house at the time when the boy had seen her."

The following case illustrates the connexion stated by mesmerists to exist between the organs of the brain (as defined by the phrenologist) and the magnetic power. Dr. Gregory gives other cases, tried by himself, with precisely similar results.

"A. F., a young man, was put to sleep by me in a few minutes. In this state, every part of the head that was tried, yielded striking manifestations of the corresponding phrenological faculty. I had no reason to think that this young man knew the positions of the organs, nor any thing about phrenology; but even if he had some general notions on the subject, the effects produced appeared so rapidly that it was impossible for him to have simulated them, even had he been disposed to do so, which I am sure was not the case. Benevolence, destructiveness, combativeness, secretiveness, acquisitiveness, self-esteem, love of approbation, veneration, cautiousness, adhesiveness, philoprogenitiveness, tune, &c., were all tried, first in rapid succes-

tion, and all yielded strong manifestations, although very often they were quite different from what I had expected, or were distinct when I had no clear idea of how they were to be manifested. Benevolence being touched, he instantly began to give away all his money to me, taking me for an object of charity; and when I continued the contact, took off his coat to give me. This is the almost universal manifestation of benevolence, obviously because, when the feeling is excited, its most natural result is to give to those in want. Cautiousness produced the most vivid picture of terror I ever saw; he said there was a fearful abyss before him, and felt as if he was to fall into it. Tune instantly caused him to sing; imitation, to imitate not only every sound he heard, but also, with closed eyes, the gestures made by those near him. It is impossible here to give all the details; suffice it to say, that although it looked like first-rate acting, a close study of his countenance shewed the most entire truthfulness. Besides, as I moved my hand from one organ to another, so rapidly as to confuse any one not very much in the habit of guessing what organ is touched, the effects never failed to follow. To test him further, I tried touching two organs at once, and invariably obtained combined manifestations. Thus when benevolence and acquisitiveness were touched, he put his hand into his pockets as before, but instead of giving me the contents, he treated me to a lecture on the heinousness of begging, and declared that he thought giving money the worst kind of charity. Veneration alone caused him to pray humbly and devoutly; veneration and self-esteem combined, gave rise to a prayer, in a standing position, in which he returned thanks for having been made so superior to other men in religious knowledge. This combination was accidental, self-esteem having been first much excited, with very amusing results, and veneration having been touched before the excitement of self-esteem had subsided, with the desire of reproducing the former humble devotion. Many similar trials yielded analogous results. I found also, that when, intending to touch one part, my hand accidentally glided to another, the manifestation was always that of the part really touched, not of that which I intended to touch. In the region of the supposed organ of alimentiveness, I found, within a small space, three different points, the touching of one of which produced excessive desire to eat, of another, the desire to drink, of the third, sensations of smell. To obtain these results, which could not be known to the subjects, since they were not then published, nor generally known to phrenologists, although I had heard of them, it was necessary only to move the point of the finger one-fourth or one-eighth of an inch, the three points certainly lying in less than the surface of a shilling. In all these trials, it did not signify what I wished, or what I said, only such organs were excited as I touched. I had complete evidence that the subject did not sympathise with me or with my thoughts, but that my touch excited the faculty corresponding to the part touched."

We next come to the sympathetic clairvoyance in the

magnetic sleep, by which the clairvoyante perceives events and facts when brought into contact with any object that has been in contact with the objects of his vision. The Dr. Haddock spoken of is a physician at Bolton, and E., the patient, is a girl under his care. Dr. Gregory thus describes some of the marvels he witnessed :

"Before I had seen E., I sent to Dr. Haddock the writing of a lady, without any details, requesting merely to know what E. should say of it. I did not even say it was a lady's writing, and, indeed, as the hand is a strong, bold one, Dr. H. supposed it was that of a man. E. took it in her hand, she being in a sleep, and soon said, "I see a lady. She is rather below middle height, dark complexioned, pale, and looks ill." She then proceeded to describe the house, the drawing-room in which the lady was, her dress, and the furniture, all with perfect accuracy as far as she went. She said the lady was sitting at a long table close to the wall, something like a sideboard, writing a letter ; that on this table were several beautiful glasses, such as she had never seen. (In fact, this lady writes at a long sofa-table at the wall, on which stood then several Bohemian glasses.) She further detailed, with strict accuracy, all the symptoms of the lady's illness, mentioning several things known to the lady alone. She also described the treatment which had been followed, and said among other things, that the lady had gone over the water, to a place where she drank "morning waters" for her health ; that the waters had a strange taste, but had done her good. (The lady had been at a mineral water in Germany, and had derived benefit from it. The water was always taken in the morning.) I need not enter into all the details ; it is enough to state, that not only Dr. H. did not know the lady, nor even her name, but that he had had no means of knowing any one of the details specified, and indeed rather supposed E. was wrong when she spoke of a lady, until he found that she was positive on that point. I received his answer, with the above and many more details, almost by return of post, and, in short, I was perfectly satisfied that E. had seen or perceived somehow, from the handwriting, all that she said, as I knew she had done in other cases.

"2. Some months later, I went with the same lady to visit E. She had never been told the lady's name, and was introduced to her and me as to two strangers. When she was put asleep, Dr. H. desired her to take the lady's hand. As soon as she did so, she said, "Oh ! you are the lady I went to see." "Which lady ?" said Dr. H. "Don't you remember ? The lady who sat at the table with the pretty glasses." She then proceeded to say, that the lady had been lately again at a place, over the water, where she took morning waters, and where the people spoke gibberish ; that she was better now, but had been worse, and that a doctor had repeatedly put something down her throat, which hurt her very much. (The throat had been cauterised with lunar caustic.) She specified ex-

actly the present symptoms, and entered into various minute details concerning what she had formerly seen, many of which Dr. H. had forgot, but which, on referring to his notes, made nearly six months before, he found to be correct. . . .

"I gave E. a letter, which Dr. H. supposed to be written by a lady. E. did not look at it, but felt it in her hand, and laid it on her head. She began to speak of a lady, who kept coming before her, but was not the writer of the letter. On the contrary, this lady prevented her from distinguishing the writer. She requested Dr. H. to remove this influence, which he did by blowing on the letter, and passing his hand briskly over it several times. She then put it on her head, and said that it was written by a little boy, whom she described very accurately, dwelling particularly on the peculiarities of his disposition, his old-fashioned ways, as she called them, his love of reading, and various other points, all more or less characteristic. His dress astonished her very much, and she described it most minutely in every part. It was the Highland dress, and she gave the colours and pattern of the tartan, as well as every other detail of the boy's dress and accoutrement. It appeared that she had never seen the Highland dress worn, and she thought it must be very cold. The boy was my own son, then in Edinburgh, and neither E. nor Dr. H. knew that I had a son, or that he wore the Highland dress. She told us that the lady she had first seen was one who was much attached to the boy, and described her accurately. This lady had charge of the boy during my absence, and his letter had been enclosed in one from her, from which it had just been taken when it was given to E. This accounted, Dr. H. told us, for her seeing the lady. When E. was asked whether she could see or discover the mother of the boy, she said that she had at first supposed the lady whose figure first came before her to be the mother, but had soon discovered that she was not. She said she would try to find her out, and would, as she said, ask the boy to tell her where his mother was. After a silence, she said, 'The mother left home some time since, and went over the water, but I cannot see her there now, although I see her marks in the place where she was. If Dr. H. will bring me back to Bolton, I shall be able to find her.' Dr. H. then, by a few manipulations, brought her back to her original magnetic state, and the boy's mother, who was present, having touched her hand, she exclaimed with surprise, 'Why, you are the mother of the little boy!'

"A nobleman of high rank, much devoted to science, found one day, among the gravel in his garden-walk, a small flint arrow-head, such as was in former ages used by the Britons, and is often called a 'celt.' This I folded in several folds of thick white blotting-paper, enclosed it in an envelope, which was sealed, and placed this in a second envelope. I then sent it to Dr. H., requesting him to ask E. to look at it, and tell us what she could about it. When given to her, the sealed envelope was enclosed in a second, and from the way in which I had folded it up, no one, out of several whom I tried, could

guess the form of the arrow-head by feeling it. E. first held it in her hand, and laid it on her head, and very soon drew an outline of the form of the object, which she said was enclosed in several folds of blotting paper, nearly white. As it was very small, only about an inch long, and very sharp at one end, E. at first took it for the tooth of some large animal. She said its colour was yellowish white, with a few dark streaks, and pointed out where the edges were chipped. On pursuing her examination, she said it could not be a tooth, as it was made of stone, and after (mentally) biting it, in doing which she merely approached the packet to her mouth, and appeared to be biting something, she declared without further hesitation that it was made of flint. Every detail she gave I found perfectly accurate, and as the packet was returned to me intact, I have no doubt that E. saw the object perfectly by direct clairvoyance. She could not, however, tell its use, but by sympathy, she went on to say, that a gentleman had found it in a gravel-walk in a garden; that he had worn it, that is, carried it, in his waistcoat pocket, (I think she said the left,) for some time; that this gentleman was a very great gentleman, and, in answer to successive questions, she gave the title appropriate to his rank. She was asked to observe more about him, and then said she saw him in a palace house; she spoke in whispers out of respect, and when her attention was drawn to the point, described the nobleman's person very correctly. This was done on a subsequent occasion, as I had requested Dr. H., when I found E. had discovered the finder of the arrow-head, to ask further questions about him. In sending the packet to Dr. H., and until I had heard all that E. had to say, I carefully avoided giving the slightest information either as to the object or the finder."

Equally amazing are the powers of *direct clairvoyance* in the magnetic sleep, as the following will shew :

"At the house (says Dr. Gregory) of Dr. Schmitz, rector of the High School here, I saw a little boy, of about nine years of age, put into the magnetic sleep by a young man of seventeen. As the boy was said to be clairvoyant, I requested him, through his magnetiser, whom alone he heard, to visit, mentally, my house, which was nearly a mile off, and perfectly unknown to him. He said he would; and soon, when asked, began to describe the back drawing-room, in which he saw a sideboard with glasses, and on the sideboard a singular apparatus, which he described. In fact, this room, although I had not told him so, is used as a dining-room, and has a sideboard, on which stood at that moment glasses, and an apparatus for preparing soda water, which I had brought from Germany, and which was then quite new in Edinburgh. I then requested him, after he had mentioned some other details, to look at the front room, in which he described two small portraits, most of the furniture, mirrors, ornamental glasses, and the position of the pianoforte, which is very unusual. Being asked whom he saw in the room, he replied, only a lady, whose dress he described, and a boy. This I ascertained to be cor-

rect at that time. As it was just possible that this might have been done by thought-reading, although I could detect no trace of any sympathy with me, I then requested Dr. Schmitz to go into another room, and there to do whatever he pleased, while we should try whether the boy could see what he did. Dr. S. took with him his son; and when the sleeper was asked to look into the other room, he began to laugh, and said that Theodore (Dr. S.'s son) was a funny boy, and was gesticulating in a particular way with his arms, while Dr. S. stood looking on. He then said that Theodore had left the room, and after a while that he had returned; then that Theodore was jumping about; and being asked about Dr. S., declined more than once to say, not liking to tell, as he said, but at last told us, that he also was jumping about. Lastly, he said Dr. S. was beating his son, not with a stick, although he saw a stick in the room, but with a roll of paper. All this did not occupy more than seven or eight minutes; and when Dr. S. returned, I at once gave him the above account of his proceedings, which he, much astonished, declared to be correct in every particular. Here, thought-reading was absolutely impossible; for neither I, nor any one present, had the least idea of what Dr. S. was to do, nor indeed had Dr. S. himself, till I suggested it, known that such an experiment was to be tried. I am, therefore, perfectly satisfied, that the boy actually saw what was done: for to suppose that he had guessed it, appears to me a great deal more wonderful; besides, his manner was entirely that of one describing what he saw. I regret much that I was unable to pursue further the investigation of this case, which would no doubt have presented many interesting phenomena. I have mentioned it as a recent one, and because Dr. Schmitz and others saw the facts, and can attest them."

These instances may be multiplied almost indefinitely both from Dr. Gregory's book and from the various publications, English and foreign, devoted to the subject of mesmerism. We can give, however, but the following cases of the powers attributed to Alexis, the well-known French clairvoyant.

"Mons. Sabine, chief of the station of the Havre railroad, went a few days ago to consult Alexis, who, when in somnambulism, said, 'You come about something lost in the service to which you belong?' 'It is true,' replied he. 'You are employed on the Havre railroad?' 'It is likewise true. (Mons. Sabine not having previously stated his business to any one.) It is a basket that is missing, containing some little animals.' 'They are——they are——leeches. You sent to inquire about the basket at Rouen and at Havre, and you have received no news of it. This is what has taken place. A traveller, going to Havre by your carriages on the——the——the 11th November, was greatly annoyed, on arriving at his destination, to find only one basket instead of two, which he had on setting off.' 'This is wonderful!' said Mons. Sabine. 'There were two baskets of leeches. The train (continued Alexis) on arriving at Rouen, left

several travellers with their luggage, and one of the baskets was, by mistake, on one of the omnibuses going into town, and the conductor was surprised to find that no one claimed it. From fear of being scolded, he did not deposit it in the baggage warehouse, but hid it for some time in his stable; and while it was there, you wrote to Rouen and Havre about it, the reply being that it could not be found. A few days ago the conductor put it in the goods depôt, near the entrance, and beneath the first window on the right. You will find it if you set off to Rouen; only, on account of the length of time that has elapsed, you will find about 200 leeches dead.' On the next day, Mons. Sabine returned from Rouen, having found the basket at the place indicated by Alexis, with 200 of the leeches dead. The directors of the railroad expressed themselves doubly obliged to the somnambulist and his magnetism, inasmuch as the proprietor of the leeches, perceiving that they were not found after twenty-five days, had stated their value to be double what it actually was.

"In the autumn of 1845, Alexis gave a series of mesmeric *séances* to the medical men of Havre, each of whom were permitted to bring one friend to witness the experiments. One of them took with him Mr. Featherstonhaugh, the consul at Havre, who had come over the day before from California, and was a decided sceptic as to mesmerism. In order to test Alexis, Mr. Featherstonhaugh put in his pocket, enclosed in a box, a portion of a Japanese idol which he had picked up out of the wreck of a vessel from Japan, which had been lost on the coast of California during his stay there. On being asked by Mr. F., 'What have I in my pocket?' Alexis answered, 'It looks like a beetle; but it is not one, but part of a Japanese idol with an inscription on it: you picked it up during a walk on the sea-shore in California, and thought at first it was some curious stone, but you afterwards perceived it was an idol which had been washed up from the wreck of a Japanese vessel that was lost on that coast a few days before.' The relater of this was Monsieur Paravet of Havre, to whom it was told by one of the medical men present at the time.

"At a *séance* which took place before the *élite* of the society at Versailles, Dr. Bataille, one of the principal physicians of this town, placed in the hands of Alexis a letter, and requested him to describe the residence of his son, who was living at Grandville. 'Instead of giving you an account of the apartment of your son,' said Alexis, 'I am now occupied about his health, which is very bad.' 'How! bad?' replied his interrogator. 'You have in your hand his last letter, dated six days ago, in which he states himself to be very well.' 'To-morrow,' rejoined Alexis, 'you will receive a letter from his wife, announcing to you that he is very ill. I recommend you on the receipt of this to set off *immediately*, for, knowing as you do the constitution of your son, there is only you who can save him. He is very ill.' The next day the letter arrived, and Dr. Bataille immediately set off for Grandville, found his son very ill, and, after a fortnight's sojourn, succeeded in restoring him to health. On his return to Versailles, this event produced a great sensation throughout the town."

Such is this portentous power, according to the statements of those who believe in its existence. As we have already said, we do not profess to give any opinion of our own as to its reality, though we confess we do not see how the testimony on which it rests is to be got over. Supposing, however, that these astounding phenomena do take place in the mesmerised subject, how far is it morally lawful for Catholics to take any part in acts which (to say the least) involve consequences of so strange and perilous a character? Many persons, we know, Catholics as well as Protestants, are disposed to throw the whole question overboard at once, by attributing the mesmeric phenomena to the direct agency of the devil. For ourselves, we confess that we have never either heard or read any thing which induces us to accept such an explanation of the marvels of the magnetic state. They appear to us to be the results—(supposing them of course to be true as facts)—of some hitherto unknown and totally incomprehensible natural medium, by which the mind when thrown into a morbid state, possesses powers unknown to it in its healthy condition. To say that such a purely natural and physical medium *cannot* exist, and that therefore the magnetic state *must* be supernatural and diabolic, is wholly incompatible with a belief in the omnipotence of God himself. It is idle to say that we necessarily know already so much of the laws of the universe as to be enabled to say that the magnetic clairvoyance is naturally impossible. *How* do birds migrate, carrier-pigeons return to their homes, and dogs when carried hundreds of miles shut up in baskets find their way back to the place whence they started? By instinct, it is replied. Undoubtedly; but *what* is instinct? To a person born blind, sight appears incomprehensible; and the laws of sound to the deaf verge on the incredible. To treat magnetism as scientifically absurd or impossible, appears to us the shallowest of evasions. That it may be, and is, employed by the devil for his own objects is likely enough. Of all natural instruments for the attainment of his accursed ends, we can hardly conceive any other so frightfully adapted to satanic purposes. But that mesmerism should be made use of by the devil, no more proves that it is purely diabolic in its nature, than his abuse of the Bible proves the word of God to be satanic in its origin.

On the hypothesis, then, that the alleged facts are generally or substantially true, and granting that the mesmeric is a purely natural, though diseased and abnormal state, can a Christian, consistently with his duty to God and man, in any way employ magnetism for ends in themselves lawful? The question has already been answered three separate times by the

Holy Office, which we need not inform our Catholic readers is the recognised Church tribunal for determining doubtful cases of doctrine and morals, subject of course to the supreme authority by which that tribunal itself exists and acts.

The following are the questions which have been proposed, and the answers respectively given to them :

DE MAGNETISMO ANIMALI.

N.N. supplie V.S. autant pour l'instruction et la direction de sa conscience, que pour la direction des âmes, de daigner lui apprendre, s'il est licite que des pénitens puissent être participans aux opérations du magnétisme.

*Decretum Congregationis S. Officii, Feria III. loco IV.,
23 June, 1840.*

In Congregatione Generali S.R. Universalis Inquisitionis habita in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam coram EE. ac RR. DD. S.R.E. Cardinalibus, &c.; proposita supradicta instantia, iidem EE. ac RR. DD. dixerunt: Consulat probatos auctores, cum hac advertentia, quod remoto omni errore, sortilegio, explicita aut implicita dæmonis invocatione, merus actus, adhibendi media physica aliunde licita, non est moraliter vetitus, dummodo non tendat ad finem illicitum aut quomodocumque pravum. Applicatio autem principiorum et mediorum pure physicorum ad res aut effectus vere supernaturales ut physicè explicentur, non est nisi deceptio omnino illicita et hæreticalis.

Annali delle Scienze Religiose, vol. xii. No. 36, p. 417.

Quesito proposto alla S. Inquisizione.

Nelle operazioni magnetiche scorgendosi una prossima occasione alla miscredenza ed al mal costume, si bramarebbe per tranquillità delle coscienze, conoscere quale sia a tale riguardo la vera opinione della Santa Sede.

Non si ignora la risposta già emessa dalla Congregazione del S. Officio, ma sarebbe a desiderarsi che si ottenesse dalla S. Sede una norma più determinata e più particolarizzata su questa materia.

Qualunque possa essere la convinzione individuale sopra i fatti accennati e tutti da gravi e religiosi autori, appartenendo però alla Santa madre Chiesa il giudicare e decidere in simili cose che sono di tanta importanza per la religione e per la pubblica morale, importerebbe estremamente conseguire se non formali decisioni, una norma almeno a cui possano attenersi i governi cattolici, chiamati quali essi sona da Dio a tutelare

la religione e a dar leggi per tenere in freno i pubblici costumi vegliando al loro eseuimento.

Risposta della S. Inquisizione, Feria iv. die 21 Aprilis, 1841.

In Congregatione Generali S.R. et Universalis Inquisitionis habita in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam coram EE. et RR. DD. S.R.E. Cardinalibus contra hæreticam pravitatem generalibus inquisitoribus, proposita supradicta instantia, iidem EE. et RR. DD. dixerunt: Usus magnetismi prout exponitur non licere.

Eadem die, et Feria.

Sanctissimus D.N.D. Gregorius div. prov. PP. XVI., in solita audientia R.P.D. Assessori S. Officio impertita, audita suprascripta relatione, resolutionem EE. ac RR. DD. Cardinalium approbavit.

ANGELUS ARGENTI,
S.R. Univ. Inq. Notarius.

Annali delle Scienze Religiose, vol. xiii. No. 37, p. 105.

Nuovi quesiti proposti alla S. Penitenzieria intorno al Magnetismo Animale.

Eminentissime DD.,—Cum hactenus responsa circa *magnetismum animale* minime sufficere videantur, sitque magnopere optandum ut tutius magisque uniformiter solvi queant casus non raro incidentes; infra signatus Eminentiae Vestrae humiliter sequentia exponit.

Persona magnetisata quæ plerumque sexus est foeminei, in eum statum soporis ingreditur, dictum *somnambulismum magneticum*, tam alte ut nec maximus fragor ad ejus aures, nec ferri ignisve ulla vehementia illam suscitare valeant. Ab solo magnetisatore cui consensum suum dedit (consensus enim est necessarius,) ad illud extasis genus adducitur, sive variis palpitationibus gesticulationibusve, quando ille adest, sive simplici mandato eodemque interno, cum vel pluribus lencis distat.

Tunc viva voce seu mentaliter de suo absentiumque, penitus ignotorum sibi, morbo interrogata, hæc persona evidenter indocta illico medicos scientia longe superat; res anatomicas accuratissime enuntiat, morborum internorum in humano corpore, qui cognitu, definituque peritis difficillimi sunt, causam, sedem, naturam indigitat; eorundem progressus, variationes, complicationes evolvit, idque propriis terminis; sæpe etiam dictorum morborum diuturnitatem exacte prænuntiat, remediaque simplicissima et efficacissima præcipit.

Si adest persona de qua magnetisata mulier consulitur, re-

lationem inter utramque per contactum instituit magnetisator. Cum vero abest, cincinns ex ejus cæsarie eam supplet ac sufficit. Hoc enim cincinno tantum ad palmam magnetistæ admoto, confestim hæc declarare quid sit (quin aspiciat oculis) cujus sunt capilli, ubinam versetur nunc persona ad quam pertinent, quid rerum agat; circaque ejus morbum omnia supradicta documenta ministrare, haud aliter atque si, medicorum more, corpus ipsa introspiceret.

Postremo magnetista non oculis cernit. Ipsis velatis, quidquid erit, illud leget legendi nescia, seu librum seu manuscriptum, vel apertum vel clausum, suo capiti vel ventri impositum. Etiam ex hac regione ejus verba egredi videntur. Hoc autem statu educta, vel ad jussum etiam internum magnetisantis, vel quasi sponte sua, ipso temporis puncto a se prænuntiato, nihil omnino de rebus in paroxysmo peractis sibi conscire videtur, quantumvis ille duraverit; quænam ab ipsa petita fuerint, quæ vero responderit, quæ pertulerit, hæc omnia nullam in ejus intellectu ideam, nec minimum in memoria vestigium reliquerunt.

Itaque, orator infra scriptus, tam validas cernens rationes dubitandi an simpliciter naturales sint tales effectus, quorum occasionalis causa tam parum cum eis proportionata demonstratur, enixe vehementissimeque Vestram Eminentiam rogat, ut ipsa, pro sua sapientia, ad majorem Omnipotentis gloriam, nec non ad majus animarum bonum, quæ a Domino redemptæ tanti constiterunt, decernere velit, an, posita præfatorum veritate, confessarius parochusve tuto possit pœnitentibus aut parochianis suis permittere:

1. Ut magnetismum animale, illis characteribus aliisque similibus præditum exerceant, tamquam artem medicinæ auxiliatricem atque suppletoriam.

2. Ut sese illum in statum somnambulismi magnetici demittendos consentiant.

3. Ut vel de se, vel de aliis personas consulant illo modo magnetisatas.

4. Ut unum de tribus prædictis suscipiant, habita prius cautela formaliter ex animo renuntiandi cuilibet diabolico pacto explicito vel implicito, omni etiam satanicæ interventioni, quoniam hac non obstante cautione, a nonnullis ex magnetismo hujusmodo vel iidem vel aliquot effectus obtenti jam fuerunt.

Eminentissime Domine, Eminentiae Vestrae, de mandato Reverendissimi Episcopi Lausanensis et Genevensis, humillimus obsequentissimusque servus.

JAC. XAVERIUS FONTANA, *Can. Cancell. Episc.*

Friburgi Helvetiæ, ex ædibus episcopalibus, die 19 Maii, 1841.

Risposta della S. Penitenzieria.

Sacra Pœnitentiaria mature perpensis expositis respondendum censet prout respondet: Usum magnetismi prout in casu exponitur, non licere.

Datum Romæ in S. Pœnitentiaria die 1 Julii, 1841.

C. CARD. CASTRACANE, M.P.

Ph. Pomella, S.P. Secretarius.

From the above it will be seen, that while the Holy Office has expressed no opinion as to the reality or the falsehood of the statements of the Mesmerists, nor as to its nature and origin on the supposition of its truth, it recognises the lawfulness of the employment of *any* purely physical instrumentality, however newly discovered or marvellous, provided it be employed for purposes entirely lawful, and provided it be not a proximate occasion for sin, or in any way morally perilous in its results. This we take to be the fair deduction from the above replies. At the same time, as the above facts stand, the employment of animal magnetism, even for medical purposes, would seem to be absolutely prohibited.

And to those who for any reasons may be disposed to question the wisdom of this prohibition, we offer the following suggestions, which appear to us of such immense weight, that, even supposing no Church authority had spoken on the question, we can hardly imagine a religious person informed on the facts of the case, unless grievously ignorant, grievously incapable of reasoning, or grievously blinded by a passionate curiosity, suffering himself to be mesmerised, or himself mesmerising others.

Every man being answerable to Almighty God for all his actions, it is unlawful for any person to place himself under the control of another to the extent involved in the magnetic sleep. If the accounts we read and hear are not the grossest of fabrications, the operator possesses a power over the magnetised which it is perfectly awful to contemplate. Here is Dr. Gregory, with a host of others, declaring that, again and again, almost by the mere exertion of their wills, they can make a fellow-creature, *whether man or woman*, leap, dance, sing, converse, rush towards them, follow them, and, without a single exception, submit to their commands and desires. They can make them feel and think precisely as they please, throwing them by a look or a touch into an ecstasy of passion, of love, of hate, of gratitude, of anger, almost of madness. More than this, Dr. Gregory expressly declares that a magnetised person sometimes finds himself compelled, by an irresistible force, to

perform when awake the promises he had made during his magnetic sleep. Conceive, then, any thing more frightful than such a control over a fellow-creature's actions in the hands of *any* man. The mind shudders at the thought of the enormities that might be committed by such an instrumentality. Dr. Gregory answers the natural horror felt at such a power, by telling us that magnetism, as a matter of fact, is rarely abused. He grants, therefore, that not only it *may be* abused, but that it *is* abused. But, we ask, is it not certain that the worst enormities would be concealed? Is it to be tolerated that such a boundless facility for crime of every kind should be placed in the hands of *any* person, however upright and religious, and much more in the hands of the immense majority of mankind, human nature being what it is?

And be it remembered that when a person has once succeeded in throwing another into the magnetic sleep, or even made any progress towards so doing, there is no means of putting an end to the power thus once attained. At any moment, at any place, when far away from us, it may turn out that he can exercise the same mysterious influence. Can it be right then, we say, for the sake of some *possible* improvement in the bodily health, thus to place ourselves under the dominion of any human being? I am once magnetised in the hope of being cured of my headache, or rheumatism, or some other ailment: from that moment, for all I can tell, *by the statement of the mesmerists themselves*, I *may be* practically the slave of another. Is this endurable? is it compatible with my present happiness, with my responsibility to Almighty God?

But what shall we say to the phenomena of clairvoyance? Let the reader realise the fact, that at the very moment he is reading these lines, it is possible that in some other room, or house, or town, all his actions and thoughts are being minutely described by a magnetised girl who possesses the power of clairvoyance. Yes; start, exclaim, be amazed, as we may; unless the innumerable statements of so many unimpeachable witnesses are absolute falsehoods, there is no secret which can be kept from the knowledge of the clairvoyant. The whole framework of society is shattered. The most sacred of documents are laid open for the inspection of the impertinent and the malignant. Doors and walls form no longer a barrier against the eyes of the inquisitive, the mischievous, and the debased. Secrets on which depends the happiness of individuals and families are discovered at the bidding of a chance inquirer or of a bitter foe. Either, we repeat, the whole phenomena of clairvoyance are gross fabrications, and the testimony of an immense number of the most upright of persons is to be

treated as a falsehood, or the exercise of the powers of clairvoyance is to be forbidden as an outrage on all the laws of honour and decency.

Many of our readers will themselves be able to confirm what is said *by what they themselves have witnessed*; and they will join with us, if they are Catholics, in thanking God for having given us an authority which has a right to enact laws for our guidance, and which thus saves us from yielding to the dictates of a morbid curiosity, and tampering with a power which cannot be employed without running a risk of a violation of all that is most sacred and most dear.

SHORT NOTICES.

FATHER NEWMAN's *Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England* (Burns and Lambert) are now completed, with a brilliancy and power which has more than sustained the promise of their opening. We hope to review them at length in our next Number. What effect they will produce time will shew; but in the mean time we cannot help pointing to an article in the *Times* newspaper of the 9th of September, which affords as curious an illustration of the cunning with which Satan uses his instruments and blinds his followers as any we remember to have met with. In the *Times* of the 8th of September appeared a clumsy and garbled report of the Catholic meeting held at Birmingham on the previous Saturday, to thank Father Newman for his lectures. A few days before, the *Times* had given a professed review of Father Newman's *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, in which the writer had violently attacked and misrepresented one of the masterpieces in the volume, the sermon on the "Mysteries of Nature and Grace," carefully ignoring all the rest of the discourses.

Now mark the subtlety of the enemy of the Church of God. In the article commenting on the Birmingham proceedings, he makes his tool tell the world that the meeting was held *for the purpose of applauding this very sermon on the Mysteries of Nature and Grace*; and at the same time he repeats his previous calumny, that Father Newman had declared "that the existence of a Deity, or of right and wrong, rests on no better evidence than the most questionable legend of the most apocryphal saint in the Roman Calendar!" Father Newman's argument was this; that as, in spite of certain unfathomed mysteries or *difficulties* (as they appear to our feeble intellect), we all believe in the existence of Almighty God and of a moral law, so we are bound to believe in the Catholic

religion, because it rests on the same kind of proofs, and is accompanied with no greater difficulties. Then comes the devil, catches up his words, and informs the English public that Father Newman asserts that *little* as is the proof of Catholicism, and *overwhelming* the difficulties against it, the proof of God's existence is no better! "You believe in God," says Father Newman, "*therefore* believe in the Catholic religion:" "You disbelieve in Catholicism," the devil makes him argue, "*therefore* disbelieve in God." Oh! plausible, ingenious, infernal subtlety! How truly is the author of man's ruin termed the Father of Lies and a *Deceiver*! Yet the chief instrument of this enemy of God and his saints is the idol of the great English people! However, Almighty God can employ even the *Times* for the conversion of souls, and we do not doubt that in this instance it has overshot its mark, and has helped in the circulation of Father Newman's writings.

The authoress of "Geraldine" has essayed a bold flight in her poem, *St. Mary and her Times*" (Dolman), in fourteen cantos. Perfect success in handling such a subject in verse is perhaps scarcely attainable. From its date—"Rome, 1846"—it appears that the poem was written some years ago, though only now published. It is designed to give a narrative of such events in the life of our Blessed Lady as are recorded in Holy Scripture, by tradition, in the writings of the Fathers, and in those revelations to different saints, which have been proposed by the Church to the pious consideration of her children.

Mr. Maccabe has edited, with a very important preface, a curious pamphlet, called *A True Account of the Hungarian Revolution, by an American Democrat* (Richardson), which we recommend to the study of all who believe in Hungarianism, more especially the twenty-eight points in which the writer sums up his statements, at pp. 135-138.

The Catholic Church and the Holy Bible—Protestantism and its Variations: Choose which you will (Stutter, York), is an ingeniously executed broadsheet, fulfilling the promise of its title, which will be found useful for hanging up, to make Protestants do what they are so little inclined to—*think*.

The annual circular of a very useful institution, *St. James's Dispensary, Spanish Place, London*, contains a brief appeal from the resident clergy to their flock, which we trust will be gladly responded to.

Correspondence.

[WE have received many communications on the subject of the letters containing queries for solution, which have appeared in the last few Numbers of the *Rambler*, expressing very conflicting opinions as to the judiciousness of inserting them in a journal read by all kinds of persons. It is difficult to decide on a subject where judgments entitled to weight appear on opposite sides. On the whole, however, the balance of opinion seems to be against their continuance. The subjoined letter is entirely of another character, and enters on the discussion of a most important subject, which we have long wished to introduce to our readers. It is well worth serious attention.]

CATHOLIC POPULAR EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—As the subject of the education of the labouring classes gives rise to a great number of different opinions, and is viewed amongst ourselves in extremely varying lights, some anticipating very serious evils, and others expecting from it the coming of a new and bright era, possibly even of the millennium, it cannot but be inferred that the ideas respecting education, on which these very conflicting judgments, with all their intermediate degrees, are based, must be far from clear. The experience of the generality of discussions, often warmly maintained by persons of different sentiments on this subject, certainly shews that seldom if ever does any result ensue. The disputants part, each the more confirmed in their own notions, and more than ever convinced of the error of their opponents. Now, this circumstance alone is quite sufficient to indicate that the subject of education is one upon which we Catholics feel strongly, but, as yet, have thought and reasoned very little.

Yet of all the classes in the community we are by far the most bound to reason, to sift, and, if I may use the word, to *profound* the whole question. We ought to know most clearly *what* we are doing, and *why* we are doing it; we ought to understand what precise and definite ends we propose to attain; and whether the means we are employing are really suited to attain the end or ends which we propose. In short, when we speak of education, we ought to know exactly how much we mean by education, and how much we do not mean. I. Whether, for instance, education means merely the time spent, and the knowledge acquired in a school, and under a schoolmaster; or whether it means also the habits of vice or virtue acquired during this time in the school. II. Whether education is limited to the school and schoolmaster; or whether it also admits the teaching and influence of the parents at home, and of the society of other children and people. III. Whether education stops when the school-process ends; or whether it goes on afterwards in the factory or the workshop.

Yet, in much that has been written, and in all that is disputed, the fact is, that the term "*education*" has been and is, used without any settlement beforehand of how much or how little it is understood to mean; and hence arise the endless cross purposes of those who make it the subject of the discussions to which I have referred. Those who

dispute do not determine beforehand what they mean by "education;" possibly in some instances they may not even have thought!

With your permission I intend to propose a series of questions relating to the subject of education; and, if I venture to answer them, I particularly desire to be understood to speak under the correction of any one who will be charitable enough to give his time and his thoughts sufficiently to the questions to be proposed, to enable him to set me right, where he may judge me to have gone wrong. What we Catholics most of all want, in all the practical measures which we undertake, is completely *to understand* what we propose to do; and then to set ourselves to execute our task as workmen who do understand what they are going to do. David, before his death, gave two pieces of advice to his son Solomon, to act like a man, and to understand beforehand all that he did: *Esto vir fortis, et ut intelligas universa quæ facis*. Now the possession of the desired understanding of this question of education, I certainly do not claim. I shall be completely rewarded if what I say may lead to our obtaining it from some other quarter.

QUERY I. The inspection of Catholic Schools by an Inspector, who visits them in the name of Her Majesty's Government, and makes almost daily reports of all that he observes to the Lords of the Committee of Council, a general summary of which is printed and published at the end of one or more years. Is this a desirable thing, or is it not?

This is a controverted question. Some represent it as possessing great advantages, and express their continual surprise that the Brothers of Christian Doctrine have hitherto been so little alive to their own interests, as not to discern these advantages, and to have uniformly declined to avail themselves of the visits of the Inspector. Others think that in so doing they shew their great good sense and wisdom.

Whether it be desirable or not, I think it is almost bootless to inquire; for the reason that, whether it be so or not, we cannot help ourselves. We are not independent of the aid which the public funds supply; we have a just right to our share with others; and the condition of admitting an inspector is by no means a point on which we have been singled out for any special or peculiar oppression. On the contrary, there is something to be said in behalf of the condition. The Government distribute the public money for effecting a purpose admitted to be beneficial; and as guardians of a public trust, they can say with justice, We are entitled to be satisfied, by an Inspector whom we shall send, that you who receive our money really employ it upon the objects for which you have both asked and have received it; and it is your duty to admit our Inspector, and to give him every means of making a full and fair report.

So far there is nothing that seems open to exception. The Inspector arrives at the time announced at a given school, finds the children in somewhat of holiday attire, and in a state of expectancy; examines the different classes, either passes a compliment or two upon the state of proficiency in geography, summing, and all the numerous acquirements of the children, or looks grave, as the case may be; he gives some useful hints to the schoolmistress, casts an eye round the room, inspects the desks and inkstands, walks round the playground with the priest, with whom he afterwards dines, and in the evening sends up his official report to "My Lords." In this report, if he has been satisfied, he says, "My Lords, it becomes my pleasing task to communicate the interesting intelligence, *annuntio vobis gaudium magnum*, that in the school — which I have inspected to-day, I have found several little girls who have manifested a most consoling thirst for the acquisition of know-

ledge, and an extremely keen capacity of adding to the already large stock which they have acquired; and further, that I also met with two little boys under eight years of age, rejoicing in the names of Bill Jones and Jacob Smith, who could satisfactorily explain the rainbow; not to mention others who exhibited the greatest intelligence. I can assure your lordships that the cause of popular education is, on the whole, making most satisfactory progress in this locality; such, in fact, as cannot fail to cause your lordships the most rapturous delight." The report duly arrives, is opened and spread out by the Secretary, and obtains a glance from the eye of one of my lords, who is thereupon immediately raised into the air in an ecstasy. It is then filed in due course, and consigned to its official rest on a shelf.

Here the inspection terminates, as far as it immediately affects the particular school. The priest, the master or mistress, the pupil-teachers are at liberty to attend to as many or to as few of the suggestions and recommendations made by the Inspector as they please, and to be as much affected by or as indifferent as they choose to the folio report which will go up to my lords, by the same or the following night's post, of all that has been seen and heard.

Inspection, however, as it affects Catholic education generally, does not quite end here. It is not merely that we admit a person amongst us taking notes; but "*faith he'll prent 'em.*" There appears in print either an annual, biennial, or triennial report addressed by the Inspector to my lords, by which, through the summary of Catholic proceedings in the matter of education therein set forth, the Catholic body is supposed to be summoned before the tribunal of public opinion to take its trial. In the first report, individual schools with their masters and mistresses were subjected to this ordeal; and sentence was pronounced upon them according to their merits or demerits; in the last report, chiefly generalities respecting us have been laid before my lords.

I put the question, then, What is the value of this report to us? It is plain that my lords regard the report, addressed as it is to them by their own Inspector, printed, published, and circulated at their direction, as their own instrument for rendering us in their way amenable to public opinion, since we do not in any way fall under their jurisdiction. Now how are we affected by it? The answer still appears to me the same as before, *i. e.* "*as much or as little as we think proper.*" It is not addressed to us, but to my lords; let my lords, then, ponder over and profit by it as much as ever they please. It is for them, and addressed to them, and proceeds from their own functionary; clearly, then, they are the persons to study it, and to imbibe all that it contains. As for ourselves, if we can hope to find any thing useful in it, it is considerate in the extreme on the part of my lords to afford us the means of perusing it; and we trust that we are sufficiently awake to our own interest to profit gratefully by the boon. But if, from whatever cause, we have no such hope, nothing compels us to pay a moment's attention to the report; my lords being the persons whom it concerns, not ourselves.

So much for Government inspection of our schools and school proceedings; to my lords it is no doubt, according to its intrinsic nature, a matter of all-absorbing interest; to ourselves, it is a matter about which we may be concerned, *as much or as little as we think fit!* A poor unfortunate teacher may certainly, by means of it, find that the incompetency of himself and his school have obtained a place in the chronicles and historical records of the nation; but, poor man, human life is exposed to great trials by its very constitution; he must try to console himself with this thought, and dismiss, as I must now do also, the

thought of Government inspection from his mind. It is not a thing about which we need be concerned more than we ourselves please.

QUERY II. What do we Catholics understand by *education* in the broad general meaning of the word? This is an all-important question, and requires a careful answer.

Education means a *process of drawing forth*; and in order for the process to exist, it requires to be applied to a subject that has life and faculties, which although they derive their principle of being elsewhere, depend upon this external process for the due attainment of their mature state. Such is the human body, which for a time is absolutely dependent upon external care, and always dependent upon food and clothing. Such is the human mind, which is dependent upon *external care* for the gradual attainment of all the various powers proper to itself. Its Creator sends it into the world in the first instance just as feeble as the body, which is its instrument and companion, and equally dependent upon the care of others for attaining its mature growth and the possession of its powers. This external care under which the body grows we call *nursing*, and that under which the mind grows we call *education*. In either case it is an external care applied to the drawing forth of the inherent capacities for growth, which both body and mind respectively possess, and to the supplying both with the proper food and nourishment which they respectively require.

The importance of this external care is as clear as can possibly be in either case. The infant body which is not properly and wisely nursed runs a great risk of dying, or at least of a sickly and diseased growth; the infant mind not properly trained becomes a feeble and imbecile thing, or, as in the extreme cases of children found wild in the woods, a thing which scarcely shews even the signs of human reason at all.

Hence, from the very nature of the human being, nothing can be more indisputable than the importance of the *question of the true education* of this mind, which, by the law of its being, is so dependent upon an external care. I do not wonder at the discussions to which it gives rise, or the deep feelings that are attached to it. The wonder rather is, that the discussions are not more numerous, and the feelings deeper; and be they what they may, they must always fail to be commensurate with the importance of the question at issue.

QUERY III. Has the Catholic body any principle or principles affecting the question of education which are peculiar to itself, and not held by any other body of persons whatever?

I answer, it has! Principles so absolutely peculiar to itself, that in the work of training the mind to the acquirement of its powers, it cannot amalgamate with any other society, but is bound to remain separate from them, and itself to suffice for all that the education of its own members requires, inexorably rejecting all interference whatever.

The first of these principles is, that the end for which man was created is *to learn to love God and to practise virtue*.

The acquiring of knowledge and the training of the powers of the mind, lawful and praiseworthy as it may be in its degree, that is, when pursued in conformity with the order of God's providence, which assigns to different men different degrees and kinds of mental labour, is in *no sense* the end for which man exists in this world. The law runs, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread." And consequently mental labour, in varying degrees according to the nature of the labour, is the law under which we live; and for the needs of this labour,

together with the duties of social life, we need the cultivation of the powers of the mind, as much as we need the nursing and care of the bodily frame.

But the end and problem of man's being is not the cultivation of the powers of his mind, as if it were possible to rest in these as an end ; but it lies in the question of the future heaven or hell, where his abode is hereafter to be for all eternity ; and this problem is solved either by his now learning to love God, to keep his commandments, and to practise virtue, the reward of which is heaven ; or by his learning to hate God, to despise his laws, and to be indifferent about the practice of virtue, the end of which is hell.

In the course of this process of learning either to love or to hate God and his laws, which is his moral probation and the law of his being, man can of course attain to any degree of perfection in the use and command over the powers of his mind. He can become educated in the fullest sense of the word ; but being educated, he can use his education as his special instrument, either of serving his God and furthering the work of redemption, or of rebelling against God and opposing his work. The man may become a Voltaire, or a Hume, or a Tom Paine, or a La Mennais, by the training of his mind, as well as a St. Augustin, a St. Thomas, or a Rosmini ; just as by learning military tactics, he may become the leader of a revolution to deluge his country with blood and to overthrow society, as well as the commander of a regular force to protect and to save it.

A system, therefore, for the mere training of the powers of the mind, be it ever so perfect, is no subject of rejoicing or approbation to the Catholic judgment. Our education is more than this ; rather this is but an element in our education, and a *purely subordinate one* ; to think otherwise would, on our part, be too unfaithful to our Lord and Redeemer. We set his love and allegiance to his Church above the acquisition of the knowledge of his creation. Listen, ye promoters of the advancement of the human race in the attainment of knowledge, ye enlightened men of the nineteenth century, to what a Catholic has to say : *If we have a child to teach, our first care is to teach him that God is present on the altar, and is there offered up in sacrifice to obtain the blessings we need in this life and in the one to come. That the path of his salvation lies in his never deserting that altar, but in being fed with the bread of life from it throughout his life (the training of his mind to the acquisition of knowledge being a subordinate affair, as knowledge itself has no power to make him happy).* And now if you ask, What is this altar, and where ? Bear with the announcement—*It is a Popish altar, and he who ministers at it is a Popish priest !*

Men of the 19th century, of enlarged minds and expansive views, have you never been tempted to say, on seeing our efforts to gain schools and education, " Well, these Catholics are not so behind the age, after all ? " But do we not here completely part company with you ? You see, without the Popish altar and the Popish priest, in our meaning of the word, there is no *education*. With these Catholics then, you will say, " Yes, yes, it is the old story. It is the *Priest*, the *Priest*, the *Priest* ; nothing but the *Priest* ! " You are profoundly right ; in the sense you mean, it is so.

Would to God that we ourselves as fully understood this great truth. Would to God that we were free from the danger of being blinded by the popular delusion of our own day, that the problem of human life, its happiness for this life and the life to come (if there is such a thing, that is, as some, of course not Catholics, will say, as the life to come), is

to be solved by the acquisition of knowledge and by the labour of the schoolmaster.

When a *popular delusion* is widely spread, is acted upon, and lives in the minds of numerous committees and boards of guardians, and even contributes to the joys of my lords of the Committee of Council; when it expresses itself in ovations in the public prints, and arrogates to itself victory over crime, the diffusion of light, the dispelling of darkness; when it claims to be that particular remedy and satisfaction, which the stimulated and restless mind of the discontented and suffering mechanic of our large towns feels that it needs, and in a word, to be the golden key to the great problem of human life; is there no danger, that here and there among ourselves, there are those who may for a time be carried away with the delusion, and forget what our faith writes on the wall with a visible hand, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve?* "The utility of knowledge," remarks M. de Tocqueville (*American Democracy*, vol. iii. p. 75), one of the keenest of recent observers of the popular current of thought, "is discovering itself to the mass of men with a clearness peculiar even in their own eyes. Those who do not taste its charms experience its effects, and make some efforts to obtain it." This is the popular current, this is the march of the human mind towards the idol of our day; this is the golden image which the 19th century Nebuchadnezzar has set up, and blows with his sackbut, psaltry, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, to announce to men that they are to fall down and worship—to worship, that is, *knowledge*, knowledge of geometry, historical, genealogical, physical, and animal geography, chemistry, mineralogy, meteorology, astronomy, &c. &c. *Knowledge* is the golden image of the 19th century. And before knowledge, it is confidently reported, that the demon of Popish priestcraft will be scared to an effectual flight, and be driven to take refuge with his dear brother and associate, Asmodeus, in the upper parts of Egypt.

Are we wholly invulnerable by this wide-spread delusion? Is it no demand upon the faith and moral courage of a Catholic, to avow in the face of day the supremacy of the altar, and of the love of the God, who, by an unspeakable mystery, dwells there, over the people's idol, knowledge of the visible creation! expansion of the mind! enlightenment!

It is surely a demand upon our faith. But where in this world shall we escape from demands upon our faith? Never while we are in it can we hope for this. The worst evil that can befall a Catholic is to be ashamed of the principles of his faith. Our principle in education is that of the Apostle, *supereminentem scientiæ Jesu Christi charitatem*; the love of Jesus Christ, which surpasses all knowledge.

QUERY IV. Is the *mental training* that is suited for the condition of a labouring man, in a Catholic's judgment, essentially or not essentially different from that which is suited to a rich man?

I think I may answer the question by saying, that I see no reason why the judgment of a Catholic on this point should materially differ from that of any other man of good common sense. A Catholic's answer on this point may safely proceed from a principle which he may justly hold in common with other men of sense, and which few will venture to dispute. The mind and its powers are wanted for the labours and needs of social life; now these are extremely various, consequently the training preparatory to them must vary in the same proportion. A man who wants to be a prize-fighter subjects his body to an entirely different discipline from that of the man who is learning to dance a polka; and he who wishes to be able to ride a steeple chase, goes to a

different school from that chosen by the man whose aspirations are only to figure on horseback by a lady's side in Hyde-park. So precisely with the powers of the mind. The lawyer is trained to legal knowledge, the physician to that of medicine and anatomy, the priest to theology and the Scriptures; the artist to his art, and the artisan to his trade. And Cobbett, who, if any writer can be said to represent English common sense, passed his judgment by saying, that "the shoemaker who knew how to make a good pair of shoes was a better-educated man than the parson who did not know what the doctrine of the Establishment was." Goethe, in the collection of his sayings at the end of the quarto edition of his works, commends the opinion that was current in Greece, that the inhabitants of the island of Ægina understood education better than all the other Greeks on the ground, because their island being barren and unproductive, they sought to make all their population clever boatmen, and thus gained a good livelihood by fishing. The superiority of their ideas then consisted in this, that with them education was the directing the powers of the mind to *an end*. I am not, of course, supposing that the Greeks meant by this that they considered "catching fish" abstractedly the highest aim to which the powers of the mind could be directed, any more than that we now mean, when we praise the practical genius of the English people, that the production of calico and machinery is abstractedly the highest aim of the human intellect. But the Greeks meant, that education was best understood where it was best directed to a definite end, it being presumed that the people themselves were the best judges of the end which they sought to obtain.

It is from this principle, viz. that true *education* means the training of the powers of the mind to a particular end, that the answer to our question must proceed.

The labouring man wants the powers of his mind for his work, whatever it may be, by which he supports himself, his wife and children, for his rest and recreation by his fire-side in the midst of his family, and for learning the law of his God; for more than this he does not want his mind, for this is his life; a life poor in this world, without honour, and not uncommonly despised; but if he be religious, rich in faith, and in the hopes of the life that is to come. "The wisdom of a scribe," says a writer who had studied human nature more than it is now studied, "cometh by his time of leisure, and he that is less in action shall receive wisdom. With what wisdom shall he be furnished that holdeth the plough, and that glorieth in the goad, that driveth the oxen therewith, and his whole talk is about bullocks? He shall give his mind to turn up furrows, and his care *is to give the kine fodder*." The same writer then draws a picture of the carver, of the blacksmith, and the potter, and their characteristics are, that they all give their mind to their work. "The carver gives his mind to the resemblance of the image, and by his watching he shall finish his work. The blacksmith setteth his mind to finish his work, and his watching is to polish it to perfection. The potter gives his mind to finish the glazing, and his watching to make clean the furnace. All these trust to their own hands, and every one is wise in his own art. Yet, these are not the men to sit in the judge's seat, nor are they to declare discipline and judgment, or to be found where parables are spoken. But without these is not the city built; they strengthen the state of the world; they make their prayer, engaged in the work of their craft. In this they apply their soul, and search in the law of the Most High." (Ecclus. xxxviii.)

The rich man, on the contrary, wants the powers of his mind for very different purposes. He wants them for travelling, for society, for

amusements, for *killing* his time as it is called, for managing, or rather interfering with the management of his estate, and the like. The two kinds of life have very little in common, and consequently, admitting the principle that education is the training the powers of the mind for a particular end, namely, the labour or the needs of after-life, it follows that the education which is good for the labouring man is quite a different thing from the education required by the rich man.

QUERY V. Is education, as it is conducted in our Catholic schools, so directed as best to consult for the true interests and wants of the labouring classes?

Upon this point I shall speak with perfect frankness, and say that, with the very best, nay most unexceptionable intentions on the part of those who promote and direct it, I do not think that it does wisely consult for the real wants and needs of the labouring classes: and I assign as my reason, that it falls down too much before the popular idol, *mere knowledge*, really to consult for their wants. There is too much of *mere knowledge worship* in it; too much of knowledge not directed to any end, even remotely affecting the life of the labouring man.

To teach the ignorant is of course a work of mercy:—who doubts or disputes this? So also is it a work of mercy to clothe the naked; yet even in this latter there is a way of going to work that may turn what was intended for a kindness into an injury. There is in the history of Sandford and Merton, a part which describes the polite Master Merton as having given a portion of his dress that was a little too highly decorated to be quite becoming to the poor sweep, upon whom, however, he bestowed it with the best intentions. The poor sweep, in this unusual and gaudy attire, was soon afterwards knocked down by his companions, rolled in the mud, and, if my memory does not fail me, he shortly afterwards returned to his benefactor and gave him back his unsuitable gift, telling him of his pitiful case, and that all the good that he had gained from it had been that it had brought him in for a beating and a being rolled in the mud. We should be prepared to contemplate the possibility of something quite similar happening in the instruction intended to benefit the children of the poor. To force the acquirement of mere knowledge upon them, that has no reference to their state or prospects in life, is not really a work of mercy to them, but simply on a par with the giving the embroidered piece of dress to the poor sweep. To what good practical purpose can it be to load the memory of the poor little daughter of a cottager with the longitude and latitude of towns in China, which in no way concern its life? I picture to myself an affectionate, nice, rosy-cheeked cottager's daughter, as we often see such children, with the clear complexion, artless sweetness, the bright eye and cheerful countenance that are found in such numbers in our country villages. This little child's future life will be a simple, innocent, domestic life. Now what is she learning at school in the way of preparation? She is learning there the longitude and latitude of places she will never see, the contents of mines that she will never visit, the length and width of rivers she will never cross, the last census of towns she will never come near, descriptions of birds and beasts she will never behold, except she should happen to be taken to the British Museum, and should there spy out a specimen or two stuffed, and the habits of fishes and animals that will never come in her way. This is the sort of knowledge which, without quite excluding what heretofore has been deemed useful, viz. reading, summing, writing, grammar, &c., she is learning; and the thing to observe is, that it is *this very knowledge*

which is supposed to be the pre-eminent and distinctive *merit* of the system of education under which she is being taught. What is the principle or foundation of this system of teaching such kind of knowledge, and making so great a point of it? It is the popular axiom of the day, viz. that it is *knowledge* which *expands the mind*, and that to have the *mind well expanded* in education is the grand thing.

Now to dismiss for a moment the question of the use of such knowledge to the child of a labouring man, and even to admit, for argument's sake, the principle that *expansion* of the mind is the *grand thing* in education, I ask, Does this sort of knowledge cause this *expansion* of the mind, which you aim after? Are you so completely sure of your result? Observe, the knowledge in question is the knowledge of isolated facts and disconnected pieces of information. Its expansive virtue cannot, then, be restricted to one set of such facts more than to another; and therefore any such person who has the knowledge of a sufficient number of such facts must be judged to possess a well-expanded mind. Now on this shewing, who shall compete, in point of expansion of mind, with a London cabman? Here you have a man who knows the names of all the streets in London and its environs, most of the principal shops, all the tea-gardens and public-houses, and their absolutely exact distances from every stand where he posts himself,—who knows all the different trades and professions by their dress and manners as they walk in the streets. Who shall compete with this man in the knowledge of facts, if this be *expansion* of mind?

But even admitting it to be proved that this knowledge both expands the mind and is found by experience to be really suited to the needs of a labouring man's life, I proceed to ask, Is it likely to be retained in the memory for any length of time after the pupil is withdrawn from the school, and goes to his or her way of life, whatever it may be? For knowledge forgotten simply ceases to be, and has no existence, and therefore cannot be of any use. Prior to an experience which I do not possess, it would be hazardous to pronounce; but as shewing what a person of common sense expected to happen in the case of her own daughters who were training as pupil-teachers, I may mention that on a pastoral visit to her, I asked the question—"Come, now, Mrs.—, tell me the honest truth; do you really think that all the things your daughters are learning for this examination will be of any actual use to them?" She replied, "Well, sir, it cannot do them any great harm! for they will forget it all again in six months; and you know, sir, the Government now gives money for it, and it is always convenient to have money."

But, again, is there no danger of this kind of knowledge having, besides its supposed beneficial effects in the expansion of the mind, also its counterpart of evil, which has not been bargained for, in breeding conceit and discontent with a humble condition in life, petty self-sufficiency, insubordination at home, and disdain of all homely occupations and of domestic duties? There are numbers of sensible persons who say confidently, that the result of our present schools will be, that there will be no more good maid-servants, who will stay in their places, and merit the confidence of their mistresses. Now, this is a testimony to the practical working of our schools, which comes with a weight that cannot be set aside; I shall not say that I know it from experience to be just, but I do say that, prior to any experience whatever of the actual results, it is what I should myself always consider ought to be expected as the natural fruit of the system pursued. One swallow, of course, does not make a summer; and the solitary instance, therefore, that did fall under my

observation, by itself proves nothing. It was, however, precisely of the kind I should myself always expect. The child in question had been a mistress in a large school for some years, with great applause for proficiency in numerous different branches of knowledge, and now, for the first time, was required by her mistress to mend her own stockings. Oh, the horror and disdain! oh, the sense of indignity! A being gifted with such knowledge as hers made to mend stockings! forbid it, education and science! But still, in spite of either education or science, and amid floods of tears, the stockings were mended in the presence of the mistress, and the most really useful lesson in the education of that child was there and then taught.

On the whole, then, as regards the really beneficent character of the system of teaching rather largely pursued in our existing schools, especially in Ireland, a practical judgment may be approximately formed, by making choice between the conflicting first principles on which the various ideas that are in vogue rest for their basis.

If a person takes for his first principles, the popular axiom of *knowledge worship*, that the problem of human life is solved by the acquisition of knowledge, that expansion of the mind is the end of life, and that the possession of knowledge is this expansion of the mind; then, of course, the more competent the schoolmaster is to impart knowledge, the more vigorously he drives his pupils forward, and the faster they move on under his driving, to the acquisition of the knowledge that he teaches, the more completely is the *end* of their life in the way of being attained; and the greater, of course, is the satisfaction of the person who holds this principle; for he can reflect with continual joy, that if the children brought up in this way in the school do but carry into after life the habits begun to be formed of amassing knowledge, which it is to be hoped that in the majority of cases they will, and if they faithfully employ every spare half hour they can dispose of in some kind of investigation, that then the amount of knowledge they will thus acquire before they die will be something quite enormous. How consoling a thought for such persons!

The advantage to the person holding this principle, moreover, is extremely evident, for it disposes of every question that can be raised against it.

Does an opponent ask, What can be the use of this knowledge to the labouring man? He replies, What! don't you know that it expands the mind?

But how do you know that it expands the mind? It is quite certain that it does!

But then it will be forgotten when the boy or girl leaves the school. No, they will acquire such an appetite for knowledge, that they will always be more and more expanding their minds by the acquisition of fresh knowledge.

But it will make them conceited, discontented with home, dissatisfied, insubordinate and contemptuous to their parents, whom they will look down upon as ignorant; it will make them jealous of each other's acquirements. All this, he will say, does not signify, they will have expanded minds, and that is the great thing!

But if a person sets out from totally opposite first principles, first principles of revealed religion and religious common sense, that the problem of human life is solved *by the love of God, and of his moral law*, not by the acquisition of knowledge; if he adopts the principle of the Greek nation as to the education of the mental faculties, which is also that of religious common sense, that these faculties being needed

for the exigencies of actual life in this world, are then alone wisely trained when their training is directed towards the actual needs of the child's future life, which it is incumbent upon those concerned to foresee and to prepare for as far as may be;—then, instead of applauding the efforts made to spread *this knowledge*, which it is the other man's delight to contemplate being spread, he distinctly and unhesitatingly condemns it, and this on two grounds: 1st, as making that an end which is not an end, and which cannot consistently with revelation be rested on as an end; 2d, as a waste or a fooling away of the powers of the mind upon the acquisition of knowledge not at all concerning the actual life, personal or social, either of the child or the future grown-up man or woman; a labour which, as regards the person performing it, is on a par with that of a man who is *not* going to build a house, wheeling bricks and mortar to a particular place which are *never* to be used. Indirectly he may benefit by the exercise and the fresh air; but the bricks and the mortar, as he wheels them, are of no use, and his labour in wheeling them *there* has also no direct use whatever. It is precisely the same with irrelevant knowledge,—it is simply valueless to its possessor, as a thing in his possession; the labour of acquiring it may or may not have been somewhat beneficial as an exercise, but the thing acquired has no use. And as regards those who promote its diffusion, their part in the matter is on a par with the wisdom and judgment that Master Merton shewed, when, as the story runs, he gave his own smart piece of dress to the sweep. It did the sweep no good, except that it enabled him to acquire the merit of bearing to be knocked down and rolled in the mud, that is, if he did bear it patiently,—a benefit not directly intended or contemplated.

QUERY VI. What are the precise benefits which a Catholic is justified in expecting from the labours and functions of the schoolmaster?

Prior to experience there cannot, in the nature of things, be any antecedent axiom as to the good fruits of the schoolmaster's labours. Because as the foolish and ignorant nurse may kill the child by her injudicious care, so the foolish and misdirected schoolmaster may completely frustrate and baulk the benefits of education. It is a question which can alone be answered by the result. "A wise woman," says the proverb, "buildeth up her house; but the foolish woman pulleth it down with her own hands." All must admit that the schoolmaster *per se* exercises functions necessary to the welfare of society; but whether the particular schoolmaster's labours produce good result, depends, first, on the principles upon which he proceeds, and, secondly, upon his own wisdom or incompetency in carrying them out. As a corrupt tree cannot produce good fruit, so, in the work of education, there is nothing so fatally baneful, so deeply to be dreaded, as *false first principles* for the basis of the *working system*. Good fruit cannot come forth from them, but only in defiance of them; a case which is quite possible.

QUERY VII. What, then, is the chief thing to be attended to in the direction of the efforts that are being made for the extension of Catholic schools and schoolmasters?

Your space would not permit all the questions that might be put and answered; this question therefore shall for the present be the last; not that the subject so much as the room that can be conceded to it begins to be exhausted. It admits of an answer about which there can be but little dispute. The point to be attended to, in the first place, is this, to examine and settle the question of *first principles*; for such as are these, such inevitably must be the system, in practice, that is based and built

up upon them. The question of first principles precedes every possible question of detail that can be raised; for they are either solved by, or are completely subordinate to them.

As I have had occasion to say before, Catholic first principles in education are our distinct and peculiar inheritance and monopoly, which we neither do share, nor could share if we would, with any other society on earth. Because, whatever agreement we may find in our theoretical doctrines with those of others, however we may discover that this or that truth or principle is also a recognised part of another society's views, still, when it comes to practice and real life, *our extreme first principle*, which *is ours*, and which we cannot without apostacy deny or disown, that attachment to the Popish altar and the sacrifice offered upon it by the Popish priest, is the condition under which alone a man can be pleasing to God in his acquiring knowledge, or can find the knowledge he acquires really beneficial to himself—forces us at this point to part company, in the work of education, with all others, and all others to part company with us.

Incidentally, in the course of the answers made to the queries here proposed, what I consider to be our true principles appear; but still, I have abstained from stating them dogmatically; and I now purposely abstain from drawing up a summary of them, or from presuming to digest them into a code. I began by professing to speak under correction, and with the renewal of this profession I must for the present conclude, trusting that to some abler hand will fall the task of sifting and examining, and of shewing to us what our principles really are, and how we ought to go to work to carry them out in practice. The infinite importance of the interests at stake all admit.

I remain, your obedient servant,
SACERDOS.

DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—One or two circumstances which have come under my own observation may be interesting in connexion with the deeply interesting articles in the *Rambler*, on Devotions to the Blessed Sacrament.

First, as regards the laity receiving at the altar (see p. 108). At Marseilles, *men* are invariably communicated within the sanctuary, kneeling on the top step of the predella; the *women* are afterwards communicated in the usual manner at the rails. Talking on the subject with one of the Conceptionist Fathers, he told me that the custom had obtained since the first revolution, and though not approved of by the clergy, had never since been authoritatively forbidden. I do not know whether the same custom exists elsewhere. In Spain, the royal family communicate within the sanctuary, where likewise they kneel during Mass, and are permitted to kiss the corporal before it is replaced into the burse after the ablutions.

Again, as to using the Blessed Sacrament to extinguish conflagrations, some of your readers may have observed in the Musée at Louvain a painting representing the cessation of a fire in that town, on the Blessed Sacrament being exposed before it. In this instance, I think it is exposed in a monstrance; but whether the procession happened to be passing, or whether it was taken there for the purpose of allaying the fire, I do not know.—Your obedient servant,
Y,

Ecclesiastical Register.

THE PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND ON A NATIONAL MODEL SCHOOL FOR DROGHEDA.

LETTER OF MR. BOYLAN (ALDERMAN) TO THE PRIMATE, ON THE INSTITUTION OF A MODEL SCHOOL IN DROGHEDA.

August 15, 1851.

MY LORD,—A movement has been made in this town for the purpose of getting the inhabitants to petition the Commissioners of National Education to establish one of their Model-schools amongst us. The matter was lately brought before the corporation, and a discussion arose, in which the question of mixed education was introduced. It was argued that your Grace was favourable to the model-schools and the mixed system, because you patronise the National Schools in this diocese. Some persons appear to justify their zeal for the system by your Grace's approval of it. The matter, my Lord, appears to me and to other Catholics to be one of great importance, as on it may depend the fate of the rising Catholic generation in this town. We therefore look to you, my Lord, as our chief pastor, for counsel in a matter of so much moment, and so closely connected with our spiritual interests, in order that we may more easily determine what course we ought to take in regard to the movement now set on foot.

I send your Grace a report of our proceedings at the corporation, in order that you may more readily understand our position. I have the honour to remain, my Lord, your Grace's most obedient humble servant,
 PATRICK BOYLAN, Alderman.

ANSWER OF THE PRIMATE.

Fair-street, Drogheda, 17th August, 1851.

MY DEAR MR. BOYLAN,—I feel great pleasure in answering the questions concerning education, on which you and some other respected Catholic members of the corporation of this town have consulted me. Education is the great question of the present day, and the religion of the rising generation in Ireland, and every other country, must depend, in a great degree, on the character that will be impressed upon it. It may be made the source of great good or of great evil. It was, therefore, most consoling to me to observe that you and your worthy colleagues were determined to proceed with caution and deliberation, and a due respect to the rights and interests of religion, in discussing the important matter that had come before you. Too much vigilance cannot be employed in such an affair, for under a bad system of education, the souls of those little ones that have been redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ may be exposed to danger, and impressions made on them that can scarcely ever afterwards be effaced.

Before I enter into the subject of your communication, allow me to assure you that I do not yield to any one in a sincere desire to see our people well instructed. You, and every true Catholic, feel as I do, and our feelings are quite in accordance with the spirit of the Catholic Church. She has been the instructress and civiliser of all the nations of the earth; every noble and useful institution that we possess has originated with her; and to her are due the preservation of the arts and sciences in ages of darkness, and their revival and diffusion at a later

period. The man who accuses the Catholic Church of promoting or patronising ignorance, or of being hostile to the improvement of the mind, either does not know her history, or wilfully misrepresents it.

There is, indeed, a sort of knowledge not encouraged by our Church, a knowledge without religion; which, as the Apostle St. Paul says, puffeth up; and is described by St. James as earthly, sensual, devilish. The effects of knowledge of this kind can be easily traced in the history of Europe during the last eighty years. Its fruits have been sedition, rebellion, immorality, impiety; or, at least, an indifference to every sort of religion. Within the last twenty years the occupier of the throne in France and his ministers became its patronisers in their University system; and, though that system was altogether under their control, yet they fell victims to the wicked spirit which their favoured godless education called into existence and nurtured. 'Et nunc reges intelligite, erudimini qui judicatis terram.' (Ps. ii.)

To make these observations more intelligible, I need scarcely add that we, as Catholics, cannot sanction or recommend any system of education that is opposed to our faith, or dangerous to it. We believe that there is but one true Faith, without which it is impossible to please God; one true Church, out of which there is no salvation. Any teaching that is hostile to these doctrines, or tends to weaken them in the minds of youth, we must consider as unsuited for Catholics, and worthy of our reprobation.

Without making any further general remarks, I shall now state that it is my conviction that mixed education, in its general tendency, is dangerous to Catholic Faith, and well calculated to sow the seeds of indifference in the tender mind; and that its effects, where it has been tried, have been found pernicious. Such effects may not be immediate; they may not be verified in every individual case; but still, if the system work slowly, like some poisons, it produces its fruits surely and effectually.

The Protestants of this country seem to admit and to act on those principles. The education they give to their children is purely Protestant; their university and their colleges are altogether under Protestant control. They never send a child to any Catholic college. Would to God that Catholics were as cautious as their Protestant countrymen! The contrast in their conduct is rendered more remarkable when we reflect upon their religious tenets. Protestants do not attach much importance to any particular doctrines; they may vary their opinions every week or every month; they may believe a little more or a little less, still remaining good Protestants. The greatest dignitaries in their Church hold contradictory opinions upon the leading truths of Christianity, even upon the divinity of Jesus Christ; and it has been lately decided by their highest authority in spiritual matters—the Privy Council—that a man may hold or deny regeneration in baptism without ceasing to be an orthodox member of their communion. Whilst their opinions are so unsettled, and they are tossed about by every wind of doctrine, is it not strange that Protestants should be so anxious to impress certain notions on the minds of their children, and to make education anti-Catholic? Now, what is the doctrine of Catholics? We believe that if any one wilfully denies, or even calls into doubt, one single article of our faith, he ceases to be a member of the true Church, and must be regarded as out of the way of salvation. With St. Paul we say, 'That if an angel from heaven preached to you a gospel besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema' (Gal. i. 8). Yet it is a melancholy fact, that many Catholics send their children to schools where

our religion is impugned, and which present many awful instances of apostacy. When Catholic children are admitted to such schools, it is the fashion to call them mixed schools, and to speak of the advantages of a mixed education. The truth is that there is no mixture of Catholicity in them. It may happen that a Catholic youth will pass unscathed through such an ordeal, but even then the parent that thrusts his child into the furnace of danger must incur an awful responsibility in the sight of God.

It appears that in the discussion on education, to which you have kindly called my attention, it has been argued that I must be favourable to mixed education, because I approve of the National Schools in this diocese.

The explanation of this apparent contradiction is quite easy. In common with the other Bishops of Ireland, I abstain from either approving or condemning the National Schools in general. Some of these schools work practically well, and whilst visiting this diocese, I was happy to find the children who frequent them well instructed in their religion. But these are not mixed schools; the managers, the teachers, the children, are, I may say, all Catholics; the spirit of the schools is Catholic. There are two such schools in this town. A great deal might be said about the system on which such schools are conducted; but I do not intend, nor is it necessary, to touch on that matter now. There are other National Schools, in which the managers, masters, and children, are Protestants or Presbyterians, and which are not frequented by Catholic children. It is not in my sphere to interfere with such schools; but I may say that as Protestants are taxed for the support of the National system, it is fair that they should participate in any benefits it confers in a way proportionate to the number of their poor children. But there is a third class of National Schools under the control of proselytising parsons, or agents of bigoted enemies of our faith, in which, though the masters are Protestant, and the teaching and spirit Protestant, yet Catholic children, by promises or threats, are induced to attend. Such schools I consider most dangerous. There is no protection in them for the faith of Catholic children. The parents, indeed, may object to the teaching of Protestant doctrines, and make their representations to the board. But this is in reality no protection, when the parents are dependent on the patrons or managers of the school. It would be necessary to say a great deal about this branch of the National system. I shall for the present limit myself to observe that it is most unjust to tax a Catholic population for the support of schools of this kind, that have been, or may be, made an engine for undermining their faith. It is to be regretted that the original rules of the National Board have been modified in a manner to favour such schools that may be made nurseries of proselytism.

It will not be necessary for me to make many observations about the Model-school, which has been the principal occasion of the correspondence. The object of such establishments appears to be the development of mixed education. Protestant, Presbyterian, and Catholic teachers are to be united in them, and children of every denomination are invited to attend them, and thus a mixture is compounded that is any thing rather than Catholic. Neither the Catholic clergy nor any other Catholic body has any control over the appointment or removal of masters or mistresses, or over their teaching in the schools. The whole system tends to inspire children with the absurd idea that all religions are equally good; and is thus hostile to truth, which is one and exclusive in its nature. The system is also directed to throw the edu-

cation of a Catholic population into the hands of a Protestant government, or at least of a commission appointed by the Protestant ministers of the day. Ought Catholics, or can they, conscientiously take an active part in establishing such schools?

But it will be said that we are living in times of great liberality, and that no teacher would interfere with the religious doctrines of his pupils. This assertion is made every day, and is always on the lips of those Catholics who send their children to anti-Catholic or dangerous schools. But is it borne out by experience? On the contrary, we have the clearest evidence that men who profess themselves liberal are oftentimes most hostile to our religion, and make every exertion to injure it. Who ever enjoyed a higher character for liberality than our prime minister? Yet in his Durham correspondence he treats our practices as the mummeries of superstition, and proclaims that our Church confines the mind and enslaves the intellect. The dignitaries of the Established Church are also very liberal and enlightened men; but were they not the loudest in their demand for penal enactments against Catholics? I believe that even in this town they got up a petition against us.

Now, when we see that the most liberal of prime ministers, and the highest as well as the lowest dignitaries of the Church as by law established, do not hesitate to display great bigotry when we are concerned, are we to be assured, or are we to believe, that Protestant teachers are quite exempt from the spirit that animates their superiors? Are we over-prudent if we do not wish to commit the instruction of Catholic children to masters who, for any guarantee given to us, may be, if not open and candid, occult and insidious enemies of our faith? But even in the case that the teachers in question are altogether free from bigotry, as it sometimes happens, still may they not produce a bad effect on Catholic Faith without knowing or intending it? It is generally stated that in Trinity College there is no interference with the religious principles of the Catholics who frequent it. But the example of those in office, the sneers of companions, the spirit of the place, the atmosphere itself produce their effect; and many young men either become open apostates from the faith of their fathers, or at least lose the spirit of their religion, and abandon its practices and observances. The same effects will probably be produced in due time in our model-schools, when mixed education will be fully developed in them.

You are well aware, my dear Mr. Boylan, that our faith is to be prized above every treasure this world can afford. Our forefathers suffered the confiscation of their property, and even laid down their lives rather than renounce it. Shall we be so degenerate as to expose this precious gift of heaven, without which it is impossible to please God, to imminent danger for some paltry temporal consideration?

Be so good as to communicate my sentiments on this subject to the other Catholic gentlemen who consulted me. Assure them that I feel it my duty to aid them by my counsel on every question connected with their eternal salvation, and the preservation of the faith of our Catholic children. Having been charged by God, through the Apostolic See, with the care of all the faithful in this diocese, like the Apostle I must say, that to all I am a debtor.—Believe me to be, with sincerest esteem and best wishes, your devoted servant,

✠ PAUL CULLEN, Archbishop,
Primate of all Ireland.

PATRICK BOYLAN, Esq. ALD., &c.

NOTE.—Not having time to explain the several variations intro-

duced into the National system, I wish here merely to state that, particularly with respect to scriptural instruction, the very principle of the board, or its interpretation of Lord Stanley's letter, has been changed. For, at first, official statements were made that the Scriptures might be taught to children when *approved of by the clergy of their respective persuasions*; then they might be taught when approved of "*by their parents*;" next, this latter rule was limited to cases "*where their parents direct*;" and, next, it was extended to cases where "*the parents do not object*;" finally, where before the child was "*not allowed*," he now is only "*not compelled*," to read them.

To explain this matter more fully, I give two extracts from pamphlets written by influential Protestant clergymen. The first is from a pamphlet written by the Rev. Daniel Bagot, Vicar of Newry, &c. &c. entitled, *A Letter to a Friend on the Fundamental Principles of the National System of Education in Ireland*. Dublin, W. Curry and Co. 1845.

"There is nothing whatever in the rules or regulations of the National system that puts the slightest restriction upon the Word of God. Any patron of a National School, who desires it, may have a Bible class in that school, and may have in that class every child who either freely joins it, or whom *he may induce by advice, or persuasion, or by any means short of compulsion, to join it*. In short, the principle on which the rules of the board, with reference to religious instruction and the use of the Bible, are founded, is simply no restriction, no compulsion."

Again, "The rule of the National Board is most clear and distinct in its language upon this point. If a parent prohibits his child from joining the Bible class, it does not require the Protestant patron to become the instrument of enforcing the prohibition, but only not to have recourse to compulsory means to force the child to disregard it."

The second extract is from a pamphlet entitled *A Defence of the Irish Clergy, and a View of their Past and Present Duty*, by J. C. Martin, Rector of Killeshandra. Dublin, William Curry and Co. 1844.

"The National system of education is also relatively to them (*i. e.* the Protestant clergy)—though not in relation to the Priests' schools—changed internally. Thus, at first, scriptural instruction was limited to certain hours of the day; now it may be given at any hour. At first, *again, a right was secured to the priest to teach in the school-house*; now both the priest and every other religious teacher but the clergyman and his deputies may be excluded; and at first, rules and regulations of the board were suggested, while now the only regulations of the patron may be his own."

Pray for the Soul of

PETER M'INTYRE,

Who died September 6th, 1851, at Lytham, Lancashire, aged forty-three.

R. I. P.

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

NOVEMBER 1851.

PART XLVII.

THE OLD PRIEST'S PARLOUR.

SCENE:— *A large old-fashioned room; the walls lined with bookshelves and pictures; the chairs and tables piled with pamphlets, papers, and books; on the mantelshef a collection of relics from the Roman Catacombs, with a small delicately-carved ivory Crucifix in the middle; the windows half filled with fragmentary patches of old painted glass; at one of the tables, with a vacant space of a few inches cleared before him, the Rev. AUSTIN LYLE, sitting in a vast arm-chair, with a black velvet cap on his head, and slowly smoking a long German pipe. At another table, his friend Mr. EDWARD YORK, turning over the leaves of an immensely thick Blue-book, with marks of great interest and of respect for its contents.*

After several minutes spent in alternatè vigorous puffings of smoke and muttered ejaculations — such as Hm! Eight hundred and ninety-seven pages! The devil knows what he's about! — together with various subdued contortions of countenance, expressive of contempt and irritation, the old Priest relapses into a more placid state, and smokes for some time in silence. At length he speaks:

LYLE. And so, my dear Edward, you actually believe in vertebrated animals!

YORK. Sir?

LYLE. You believe in vertebrated animals, don't you?

YORK (*with an expression of the blankest amazement*). What do you mean, Father Lyle?

LYLE. You think it desirable that your housemaid should know that kangaroos belong to the family of *Macropodidæ*; that your cook should rejoice in the conviction that apes are comprehended in the genus *Pithecus*, a branch of quadrumanous mammals, having teeth like men and women, and

possessing neither tails nor pouches. As for your occasional charwoman and your laundress, they may be content with the information that bears are a family of *Plantigrades*, and constitute a natural group of mammiferous quadrupeds, with six incisor teeth and two canines in each jaw, with twelve molars in the upper and fourteen in the lower jaw; that they are also pentadactyle, or five-toed, and that they have short tails.

YORK. Surely, sir, you are joking.

LYLE. Not a bit of it, my dear fellow. I am only answering a small portion of one of the questions to be answered by the teachers of our embryo cooks and washerwomen, which you yourself read to me out of that big book with unfeigned admiration.

YORK. I always thought you were an advocate of popular Catholic education.

LYLE. So I am, and with all my heart, I assure you. And if I were not so before, it is high time to begin now, with such a production as those "Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education" before my eyes. Why here, saving some twenty or thirty pages from the Catholic Inspector, here are 897 pages of close print devoted to shew with what a gigantic organisation the enemies of the Church of God are bringing up the children of Great Britain in the belief of every species of religious and historical falsehood. An advocate, indeed, my dear Edward; I am a hundred times more than an advocate. I tremble and shudder when I see what a machinery the enemy of our souls has here at his command; and with proportionate longings I burn to see his machinations encountered by a thoroughly Catholic system of education flourishing in every town and village in the land. But if you think to fight the devil by teaching poor boys and girls to what class of animals kangaroos belong, or by stuffing them with the jargon of science or word-knowledge of any kind, then—mark what I say—you are throwing away the most glorious opportunity given to the Church in England for many a long day, and you are adopting one of the most pernicious delusions of an age of shallowness and conceit.

YORK. But, Father Lyle, would you not teach all young persons something of the beauties of physical and natural science?

LYLE. By all means I would, *if I could*. But I cannot, and you cannot, and nobody can, in the space of time allotted to instruction in the case of the poor, and during the years of mere boyhood. This cramming with natural history, and mechanics, and astronomy, and geography, and I know not what else, is no real instruction at all. It is a mere cultivation of

the memory, a stuffing the brain with hard words and sentences which convey to the learner no positive, distinct, living acquaintance with *things*. The young mind has no natural interest in the facts of science; you have nothing to go upon in its experience and its feelings; you can only teach it words, words, words, which serve the purpose of enabling the child to pass an examination, and are then forgotten for ever, tending only to foster the natural conceit of those who think they know a little of every thing.

YORK. But surely these studies serve the purpose of strengthening the memory, and so far are useful.

LYLE. There would be something in what you say, but for one or two considerations. The memory may be equally cultivated by other studies, which are of real importance in after life, which convey ideas of things at the same time that they strengthen the memory, and which, further, bring into play various faculties left utterly barren in the process of communicating this wretched smattering of the phraseology of science. Oh, the cant, the impudence, the incredible silliness of these upholders of *useful* knowledge! *Useful*, quotha! Bah! useless, if you like, and utterly to be reprobated and cast out by every man of sound sense and earnest religion and benevolence.

YORK. Yet what will our Catholic labouring men and women do in the next generation, if they are found deficient in the knowledge which the Protestant schools are so universally conferring on their poor?

LYLE. Don't distress yourself, my dear fellow. The next generation of housemaids, and ploughmen, and greengrocers, will know no more about kangaroos, and isothermal lines, and the progress of the English language before the time of Chaucer, than Jack Smith the potboy, that I now see crossing the road and whistling one of those everlasting nigger melodies. This system of cramming the memory will produce only a race of ignorant prigs, with miserable powers of reasoning; a vulgar, snobbish taste; and a conviction that they know better than Almighty God Himself what is good for their souls and bodies. I ask you yourself, as a rational being, this question: you and I, and all the rest of what are called the educated classes, have been crammed at *our* schools and colleges with these odds and ends of science, and history, and geography, for the last two generations. There's not a young ladies' or young gentlemen's academy—(oh, what an odious word!)—where they don't learn longitudes and latitudes by the hour, together with scraps of all the sciences, and the elements of two or three languages into the bargain. Now, I say, go into any drawing-

room where you please,—say in London, from Belgravia to Hackney,—place a pair of globes in the middle of the room, and ask the well-dressed ladies and gentlemen around you to solve half-a-dozen of the “problems” which were dinned into their ears, twenty, ten, five, or two years ago, at school or college. You know what would be the ridiculous result as well as I do. Their whole actual scientific knowledge turns out to be precisely *nil*. They have gained no living ideas, no acquaintance with things; and the labour they went through led to nothing whatsoever, except the payment of the quarterly bills by their amiable and deluded parents.

The fact is, that children, like their elders, must have their minds occupied on *realities*, and not on mere senseless words and meaningless diagrams. See what painful work it is to a child to learn his letters and spelling, because the knowledge he is acquiring is to him a mere familiarity with uninteresting marks and sounds. When he begins to read, the case alters; his mind converses with things of whose nature and existence he is practically conversant, and he likes reading as much as he hated spelling. So it is in learning the first elements of any language. To most children it is an odious task; and utterly useless, unless it leads to a study of books in that language, or to its use in conversation. Now these fragments of scientific knowledge never do lead to any thing better in the case of the enormous majority of men and women. It is absolutely impossible that any real acquaintance with physical science can be attained before the age of fourteen or fifteen, which is the very *utmost* age to which the average education of most persons can be continued.

The thing is manifest even from that big book itself. Just find out those special reports on training-schools that you were shewing me, and see by the inspector's own confessions where success is best attained in teaching the young. And remember that if a branch of study is impracticable in a training-school, how much more it is so in an ordinary school. Now, then, for Mr. Moseley and Mr. Cook. Here we have Mr. Moseley at full length, pages 60 and 61, Appendix A, shewing the degrees of proficiency attained by the scholars at seven training-schools for boys of the Established Church.

You see he divides the pupils, when examined, into six classes: excellent, good, fair, moderate, imperfect, and failures. Now mark the result. In the subjects of “Industrial Mechanics,” “Popular Astronomy and Physical Science,” and the “Higher Mathematics,” the total failures *far* preponderate; while in the “Greek,” and “Latin,” and “Modern Languages,” the absolute failure is complete.

YORK. Stop, stop, Father Lyle; I have you here. Look at the class of "Excellent." There are few enough, indeed, pronounced excellent, or even good, by the inspector; but in what subjects is the greatest success, such as it is, I pray you? Why in "Geometry" and "Algebra." Aha! what say you to that?

LYLE. Precisely what I said before, that children make the best progress where their minds are conversant with subjects which to them are realities. The subjects of algebra and geometry *are* realities to a child, as much as to a grown-up person. They have nothing whatever to do with experience; they are abstractions, and as accessible to a boy's intellect as to a man's. Observe, too, that in them the memory is comparatively little tasked. Algebra and geometry are chiefly processes of reasoning, and based on a few simple ideas which a child masters with the utmost ease. I have always myself held that there are few things so easy to teach to boys and girls as algebra.

YORK. But I have heard you say also, that you would teach all our poor children Latin; and yet here it is set down as a dead failure, like "Modern Languages."

LYLE. Undoubtedly I would teach it; and why? Because to the Catholic child Latin becomes instantly a language of realities. But don't let us get on too fast. Here is Mr. Cook's report on five Church-of-England training-schools for girls: let us see what the "females," as Mr. Cook calls them, make of natural science and other subjects of study. In two of these schools "Natural History" is taught, and in both of them it is put down as a total failure. In one of them "Modern Languages" are taught, the "failures" being *ninety-one* per cent; while in two of the schools, under the head of "Biographical Memoirs," the "failures" are *ninety-two* per cent. In the other subjects, the girls succeed least in spelling and writing, while there are scarcely any "failures" at all in "Domestic Economy" and "Industrial Skill." In "Vocal Music" too the success is respectable. So much for the comparative interest of kangaroos and cookery in the minds of young girls.

But now for the Latin. With the Protestant children it is a dead failure, because they never come to *use* the little knowledge they acquire. With us the case would be entirely the reverse. The grammatical elements taught in the school would be instantly converted into realities in the offices of the Church. In the Mass, and at Benediction, Vespers, and such like, the child would find an immediate practical application for its acquirements, which would stimulate it to fresh diligence, and at the same time immeasurably increase its interest

in such offices as Vespers and Compline, which unless they are *bond fide* congregational, are no services at all. For hearing Mass devoutly, no doubt a knowledge of Latin is not in the least degree *necessary*; still it is undeniably an advantage, as will be admitted by every person who is even a tolerable Latin scholar. But in Vespers, and other offices not sacramental, some little degree of acquaintance with the grammatical structure of Latin is essential to a participation in the service. Thus the teaching of Latin in all our schools would not merely be facilitated by our habitual *use* of the language in devotion, but a great spiritual advantage would be conferred on our congregations.

YORK. Well certainly, Father Lyle, you *do* go lengths when you take up a notion. Why the eyes of many of our priests and nuns, and our fathers and mothers, would open into perfect circles, and their ears would shoot off from their heads, at the bare notion of teaching Latin to young ladies, much less to the ragged girls in our towns and villages.

LYLE. Well, my dear Edward, what of that?

YORK. Only conceive going into one's kitchen, and hearing a dispute between one's cook and housemaid as to the conjugation of a Latin verb; or an acquaintance with *hic, hæc, hoc* being enumerated in the merits of a groom.

LYLE. Don't be a goose, my dear fellow. Tell me this: if you went into a church and heard a whole congregation singing Vespers with good voices, correct pronunciation, and an evident comprehension of what they were saying, should you be gratified, or should you be disgusted?

YORK. Gratified, of course; who would not be?

LYLE. Then why on earth, if such a result could be easily brought about, should we hesitate to take the proper means for its accomplishment, through fear of the solemn frowns or ignorant sarcasms of some lazy father and venerable grandmother, who declare that it was not so in their young days? The question is this: is the knowledge of Latin *useful* knowledge to a poor Catholic; and if it *is* useful, is it of a nature to be acquired in boyhood and girlhood? Who that knows anything of the matter can say "No" to either of these queries? Here are you, and I know not how many other educational fanatics besides, worrying a miserable girl's brains with dry, barren, uninteresting facts about the latitude of some town in China, or the productions of some group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, or the number of toes and teeth and the digestive organs of some incomprehensible bird or beast,—all of which facts slip out of the memory during the first week after the child leaves school; and yet you look as if I had proposed

to turn all your children into opera-dancers when I say, teach the boys and girls Latin.

I should like to have a little talk with the mistresses of our poor-schools, and with the good ladies who have the educating of the girls of our middle and upper classes, and get them to give me a detailed account of all the knowledge they teach the young damsels under their care. Take my word for it, you would see that (in all innocence and good will) they drill the unlucky pupils into the temporary recollection of a whole host of facts in geography, history, arithmetic, and natural science—not to mention that crowning absurdity, “the use of the globes”—of which not one-half can by the utmost stretch of language be called either useful or interesting, and which will not exercise the slightest shadow of an influence on the well-being of their grown-up life. No, Edward, if you want *useful* knowledge, initiate the girls as well as the boys into the mysteries of Latin nouns and verbs as soon as they are nine or ten years old, and don't be afraid that your cook will burn your mutton-chops because she knows that *dixit Dominus* means the Lord said.

YORK. Well, but, sir, with so many subjects of study before us, how shall we decide what to teach children and what not to teach them? Don't you think it necessary for us Catholics not to be behind the age, in order to prevent Protestants from continuing to reproach us with being lovers of ignorance and darkness? Don't you think we should follow the age when it does not inculcate any thing positively contrary to faith or morals?

LYLE. Follow the devil, my dear sir! Why should I make a fool of myself because the age is an age of folly? I say if you follow the age, you are following the devil, who is leading an age of conceited shallow-pates to their own national, social, and domestic destruction. Follow faith and common sense as your guides, and they will tell you what to teach boys and girls, as well as a good many things besides. Faith and common sense say, when you can't keep boys and girls at school after the age of thirteen or fourteen, don't waste a single hour in cramming them with a mere knowledge of facts, which will neither add to their piety, or their intelligence, or their happiness, or their qualifications for fulfilling the secular duties of after-life. Don't teach them any thing that will be certain to be forgotten, and thus practically useless, unless the mere process of the acquisition of such knowledge contributes to strengthen and improve the intelligence and general character. Surely there is *some* end to be attained by popular education, there is some definite actual advantage supposed to be aimed at; or else the whole thing is humbug altogether.

Following faith, then, and common sense, I should say, *at all costs* give children an ample instruction in the doctrines and duties of religion, and in such collateral knowledge as will tend to confirm their faith and make them more intelligent Catholics and more useful in their generation. In my judgment, distinct religious instruction (in various branches) ought to form a larger portion of the material of a child's school-teaching than it does in any place that I know of; and this both as a spiritual advantage and as an intellectual training. Remember that no subjects of study more thoroughly drill and cultivate the mere intellect than the study of Catholic doctrines, of the history of the Church, of her rites and ceremonies, of the elementary laws of morality, and other such branches of religious knowledge.

A thorough religious education, then, being thus secured, the next thing, and the only remaining thing, is to prepare the young mind for its coming life in its secular aspects. And I say that common sense tells us that it is worse than preposterous to employ the few short years of boyhood in *any thing* that does not directly tend thus to prepare the youthful mind. Starting, then, with this principle, I see three separate secular objects to be aimed at in the education of a child: first, the communication of such positive knowledge as can be actually employed in the fulfilment of the duties of his calling; secondly, the general cultivation of the faculties of reasoning, taste, imagination, memory, and so forth; and lastly, the furnishing him with sources of innocent amusement and recreation.

And if you ask me on *what* subjects I would accordingly instruct the young, that, I say, will to a certain extent depend on circumstances; but I can easily give you a general notion of what I would do. Of course reading and writing come first, as being practically useful in after-life, and as the means for all other acquirements. Next, just so much arithmetic as will be actually made use of in the details of business and keeping of private or domestic accounts, and no more. The study of the higher branches of mere arithmetic is a profitless waste of time, and calls none of the higher faculties of the mind into play.

YORK. Excuse my interrupting you, but where would you stop in teaching arithmetic?

LYLE. Just where the *use* of arithmetic stops with nine hundred and ninety-nine men and women out of a thousand; with the majority, of course, it stops much before. In shop-keeping, and most of the higher kinds of commerce, all ordinary calculations are made by what is called "practice," and accounts are kept by "book-keeping." Not one person

in a thousand is ever called on to extract a square-root or cube-root, except for his pleasure. Stop, then, at "practice," and teach what you can of "book-keeping." The "rule of three," as it is called, and the use of "fractions" and "decimals," are infinitely better taught as a branch of algebra than as mere rules of arithmetic. In algebra they are understood and remembered. You will find that a child who has been driven to despair by the mysteries of arithmetical "fractions" and "rule of three," masters their whole theory and practice in a few days as a branch of algebra.

As to your algebraic and geometrical studies, let them be carried as far as you please. After the elements, there is not much to be learnt which will be practically useful in life; but then the study of mathematics is unrivalled for the strengthening of the reasoning faculty, while the study of arithmetic is all but powerless as an intellectual discipline.

History, properly so called, ought to be banished from schools for *children*, that is, from all our poor-schools. It is perfectly hopeless to attempt to create a genuine interest in what we understand by "history" in the mind of a mere boy or girl. *Stories* from history, if you like, they will understand and appreciate; but as for that chronological, broad, and complicated view of *events* which constitutes history, it is beyond their powers alike of comprehension and of memory. By all means, then, teach them stories from history, in any shape you please; but banish your historical summaries, your catalogues, and your elaborate chronologies, in company with your kangaroos and planetary orbits.

These stories themselves, too, should be all, more or less, in connexion with the history of the Christian Church, beyond all compare the most interesting and the most important of all histories. Remember that to a child religion is a reality, while politics, economics, manners and customs, and all the rest of the materials for secular history, are just so many incomprehensible words. Group, then, a sufficiency of stories from English and other secular history around your pictures from the records of the Bible and of the Christian Church, and you will have conferred on the young mind the very utmost amount of real historical knowledge of things which it can possibly receive before the age of fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen.

As to the communication of knowledge to be employed in the endless special varieties of social life, that is a more difficult matter; but still something may be done. Girls, of course, ought to learn needlework *thoroughly*; country boys should learn as much as can be managed of kitchen-gardening and other country pursuits; girls should be taught domestic

economy, including simple cookery and attendance on the sick; while boys in towns might be instructed in the first elements of such trades and handicrafts as could be put in practice in a large school.

English grammar, of course, ought to be taught in its elements, provided the memory is not overloaded with minute rules; and composition, by which I mean the *writing* of good, grammatical, simple English, be made a first point. In geography, again, I would teach nothing but what can be thoroughly understood, and waste no time on barren and uninteresting facts. To these subjects add music and drawing.

YORK. Drawing, Father Lyle! Well, what with Latin and drawing, you will astonish our old Conservatives.

LYLE. Very likely; but what then? Again I repeat, what says common sense on the subject? Is education meant to prepare the young for after life, or is it not? And if it is so meant, surely the furnishing the poor with sources of innocent amusement ought to be one of its *most* important aims. Don't open your eyes so wide, my dear fellow; but ask yourself what you have to say against this position, which I am prepared to maintain, paradoxical as it seems to this miserable careworn generation, that next to good religious instruction, the greatest blessing you could confer on the English and Irish poor would be a knowledge of, and taste for, harmless amusements. What on earth is the object of education, except to make people good and *happy*? What is the use of any instruction which tends to neither of these ends? I do maintain that the great curse of the British poor is their want of cheerful pleasures. Oh, how I abominate the cant of your comfortable gentlemen and ladies, with resources of every kind at hand to refresh them when they are wearied with the cares and duties of life, and who yet can coolly exact from myriads of their fellow-creatures an abstinence from amusement, which they themselves could not endure for a single day! Let the scientific knowledge-givers of the time say what they will, I repeat that if you could teach our enormous population to amuse themselves without sin, you would have bestowed on them a greater blessing than if you made them all Newtons or Herschels in profound acquirements. Don't tell me about *useful* knowledge; what's the use of any thing that doesn't make a man better or happier? Of course any information which *really* enables a man better to do his duty to his family and fellow-creatures, is to be reckoned as making him *better*; hence a good deal of purely secular instruction is both desirable and necessary. But it is a fatal error to suppose that mere knowledge or intellectual ability, as such, is

necessarily a blessing at all. Get rid of fashionable prejudices, and ask yourself whether you would rather be a happy ignoramus or a miserable scholar? Answer me as you may, I know what *common sense* would reply. And therefore, as I see that a capacity for harmless enjoyments is *not* possessed by our poorer classes, and that it is of first-rate importance for their spiritual welfare that they *should* possess such a capacity, therefore I say, the teaching of amusements ought to be a prominent feature in every good poor-school.

At present the mass of our population are brutish, bearish, clownish, and capable of little else but sensual enjoyments. Puritanism and drunkenness share their hearts between them, and do the devil's work with fearful effect. Strike at the evil, then, in its root. Teach the poor little things any amusement that you can, which will cost them little or nothing, and at once make them more civilised beings and better Christians.

I don't mean to say that drawing should be taught to *all* children indiscriminately, for many have no natural gift that way; but you must try it with all, or you cannot tell who are capable and who are not. And rest assured, that to those who *have* the slightest natural talent for drawing, a more delightful and more economical source of pleasure cannot be found.

As to singing, I fear our Catholic schools are still behind the Protestants in their cultivation of it. Absurdly enough, indeed; for considering what an important place is held by music in our religious services, the neglect of music by Catholics is doubly culpable.

YORK. But would you teach all children to sing by *note*, Father Lyle?

LYLE. Unquestionably; partly because they will never sing *well* until they sing by note, and partly because the study of the notes, and so forth, is every whit as good an exercise of the memory, the attention, and the discriminating faculty, as any other subject that you teach to children. We Catholics have an immense advantage over Protestants in our constant use of music in our public functions. Our children would feel an interest in their musical studies, if judiciously directed, far beyond what is possible to Protestant children. And after all, there's nothing like music for giving life and cheerfulness to a school. The boys and girls must be worn out indeed who don't shew signs of vivacity and good humour when the well-known signal is given, and the sounds, so inspiring to the souls of old and young, strike again upon the ear.

In music, however, as in all things else, beware of priggishness and Puritanism. Don't pester the little musicians with solemn sentimentalities, or disquisitions in natural history done into rhyme. Give them good music, good sense, and good fun. Ah, my good Edward, you may shake your rational head as you list; it does *my* ears good to hear a ringing shout of laughter—(at proper seasons, mind)—from a roomful of dingy-looking little vagabonds, grinning from their rags, and enjoying a lively, laughing song, as much as *you*, my dear fellow, and your companions, love a good song from Lablache, or a merry glee over a drawing-room pianoforte. I'm very glad to see a book of songs fit for use in schools* published at last, which recognises *fun* as a legitimate element in school-singing. It is really delightful to see the dear old favourites of one's own childhood coming out at last in print, with a Catholic priest's name on the title-page, and in company with a whole host of tunes and verses, every one of them not only thoroughly unexceptionable, but actually *good*. If Mr. Formby's book does not find its way widely into our Catholic schools, I shall think they don't deserve to have any person take further pains to provide them with what they cry out for.

YORK. Well, really, Father Lyle, I *do* think you would hardly keep proper order in a school where such excessively *jolly* songs as some that Mr. Formby has introduced into his book were taught the children. Only conceive a schoolmaster or mistress instructing the young warblers in such songs as "What shall we have for dinner, Mrs. Bond?" or leading off a chorus, fortissimo, "A-hunting we will go!" Don't you think all this is rather silly?

LYLE. Pray, my dear sir, do you ever read *Punch*, or make jokes, or laugh at them? Do you consider it derogatory to the dignity of human nature, in the person of Edward York, Esq., aged thirty years, to go to a concert and hear John Parry sing his delicious nonsense? And if you can split your sides at "Wanted a Governess," and yet half an hour afterwards turn to your most serious duties with a refreshed spirit, why should not these little urchins go back to the toils of compound multiplication and the pains of penmanship with renewed vigour after a musical entertainment equally delectable in their young eyes? I must say, I think Mr. Formby has shewn as good sense in the *nonsense* he has put into his book as in its more solid or serious portions, including his own verses, which I think by no means the worst part of the publication.

* "The Young Singer's Book of Songs, selected and adapted to popular Melodies," by the Rev. H. Formby. Longmans, and Burns and Lambert.

However, there goes ten o'clock, so we'll say farewell; and mind, the next heap of popular delusions you get hold of, bring them here, and we'll have a gossip over them. What a pity it is you don't smoke!

STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

[Concluded from p. 285.]

WE proceed to notice another episode of the reign of Henry VI., which we may call that of Chichley and Beaufort; and which will, as strikingly as others we have alluded to, illustrate that spirit of worldliness, the existence of which among the upper orders of the clergy was the pretext with the laity for aggressions upon the Church, and also united both clergy and laity in opposition to the Holy See. Chichley was Archbishop of Canterbury; and his character is sufficiently and significantly indicated by that fatal symptom of worldliness, his having held secular office, and also his having been one of the main movers of the unjustifiable war with France, which produced such disastrous results to both countries, and which (as the previous similar wars of the Edwards had done), by dissipating the treasure of the Crown, tempted it to attack the possessions of the Church. Beaufort was Bishop of Winchester, and also held secular office. He was all along (true to the spirit of the Church in this respect at least) the advocate of peace, as the Primate was of war. In the last reign the Pope had nominated Beaufort, who was undoubtedly an able man, for the dignity of Cardinal. This (says Lingard) alarmed the jealousy of the Archbishop: as the other legates had been foreigners, whose stay was too short to create any permanent prejudice to the rights of the metropolitans; but Beaufort would fix his residence in England, and by his superior authority for years suspend or restrain that of the Archbishops. The Primate persuaded the King to forbid the Bishop to accept the dignity; and in these feelings of jealousy and envy originated those arguments against the allowing of a *legate* to reside in this country, which recently have been ignorantly misconstrued as being directed against the residence of a *Cardinal* in this country, which, on the contrary, was always regarded as an honour; insomuch that (as already alluded to) in the preceding reigns statutes (even against provisors) had em-

bodied *exceptions in favour of Cardinals*; and the statute of provisors alleges it as a grievance, that the Pope gave benefices or bishoprics to aliens and to *Cardinals*, who (*being aliens*) *did not live here*; which some clever people have of late been so stupid as to interpret into a complaint *against* the residence of Cardinals in this country: so intense is the blindness and ignorance of bigotry! The Primate represented that “there never was a legate *a latere* sent into any land, and specially into the nation of England, without great and notable cause,” (of which cause he forgot that the Pope was sole judge); “and they when they came, abided but a little while, as *the need required*.” as if in some periods, especially a reign so disturbed as that of Henry VI., the need might not require a longer residence of a legate, who was also an *English bishop*. And indeed the facts shew that in this instance the “need” did “require;” for the influence of the legate was of great effect in promoting peace abroad and preserving peace at home, and not until after his death did those disastrous contests commence which plunged England in civil war and all its horrors for some generations. The Primate also urged that the legate was “always treated with ere he came to land, when he should have exercise of his power, *and how much should be put into execution*.” Strange doctrine this for a Catholic Archbishop! —that the exercise of the Papal power was conditional upon the consent, and liable to be restrained by an earthly sovereign! How utterly it is subversive of the Papal supremacy, no Catholic needs to be shewn; how utterly inconsistent it is with history and law, we hope our readers will, even from these articles, have been sufficiently satisfied; seeing that from the first foundation of the Catholic Church in this country, legates came and went, as Papal bulls were sent and received, at the sole pleasure of the Sovereign Pontiff: although it is possible that the occasional interference of a legate with temporal affairs (as in the reign of John) might have furnished plausible pretences for setting up some such custom as that of ascertaining, when a legate arrived, that he did not purpose any interposition in state affairs. Such attempts, however, were so rare, and so easily prevented, that they served only as a *pretext* for an opposition, as in this instance, inspired by selfish and sordid motives. The King, or rather his council, influenced by these representations, forbad Beaufort to assume the dignity offered; a prohibition directed (it is clear) exclusively against the office of permanent *legate*. Afterwards, however, he obtained the royal license to accept the preferments to which he had been nominated, and he was created Cardinal. When he arrived, the Primate and the lay lords prompted the

king's attorney-general to represent to the Council that it was the right of the Crown, founded on special *privilege* and *prescription*, (!) with the *knowledge* and *tolerance* of the Pontiffs (our readers will remark the logical and legal absurdities and incongruities of this argument, alleging *prescription* against the Pope, which never was against a *temporal* sovereign; and then incidentally disclosing the real weakness of the claim by the words "knowledge and *tolerance* of the Pontiffs")—"that *no legate should come to England unless at the petition of the king!*"

This, it will be observed, is quite different from the representation of the primate some short time before, which says nothing of this extraordinary claim, but would have certainly done so had it existed. The attorney-general out-herods the Archbishop. It is almost amusing to see the audacity with which these assumptions are trumped up against the Holy See to serve the purpose of the moment. And before the Council we also find it contended,—inconsistently enough with what had been before urged,—that Beaufort should have given up his bishopric when appointed Cardinal: so impudent and inconsistent are the assertions and assumptions to which a spirit of resistance to the Holy See from selfish motives is sure to impel men. The Cardinal retained his diocese of course. Some time after, when the Cardinal was in France with his sovereign, whom he accompanied at the earnest instance of the Council—a convincing proof that they appreciated his wisdom and sagacity,—the attorney-general was incited by the Cardinal's great antagonist, Gloucester, to impeach him before the House of Lords, on the ground that, by obtaining a bull of exemption from his diocese from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, he had incurred the penalties of the statutes of *præmunire*, especially that of Richard II., as to procuring bulls "touching the king, his crown and regalty." How absurd the accusation was, must be self-evident to our readers, and is shewn strongly by the striking fact, that when the Cardinal came home soon after, and defied his enemies in the House of Lords to come forward with any accusation against him, *no one durst do so*; but, on the contrary, all confessed him to have been a loyal and faithful subject of the Crown: a declaration which, at his demand, was entered on the rolls of Parliament. Afterwards that powerful prince, Gloucester, again assailed the Cardinal with a long and laboured impeachment, chiefly grounded on alleged contempts of the prerogatives and breaches of the statutes of *præmunire*; but neither Parliament nor the King attached any importance to it, and all fell to the ground. Surely nothing can more conclusively shew the idle

and futile character of such and all similar charges. And as it is the fashion to talk a great deal of nonsense about the worldliness and pride of Roman prelates, and the incompatibility of the duties of legates or cardinals with those of loyalty, let us close this interesting episode of Cardinal Beaufort with this simple statement, that the king himself, the best judge, from long experience, of his character and conduct as compared with the Cardinal's great rival and antagonist, the duke, declared at his death (which, despite Shakspeare's infamous and libellous picture of it, was pious and exemplary) that the Cardinal had ever been a good and kind uncle to him; while it is well known that of the duke the king at least entertained a firm conviction, confirmed by the opinion of most historians, that he was, what he often laboured to prove the prelate, an ambitious and designing man, and ultimately a traitor. Such is the episode of Cardinal Beaufort, most amply illustrating the effect of the evil spirit of worldliness in inducing the Bishops themselves to set a bad example of disobedience to the Holy See.

From the age of Beaufort we now pass to that of Wolsey, from the reign of the sixth Henry to that of the eighth. All that is necessary to notice in the reign of Henry VII. is that which will be soon seen to have had a most important bearing on the eventful reign of his successor: that the king had preyed upon his subjects, weakened by the wars of the Roses, with relentless rapacity; reviving dormant claims of the Crown—exactng payment of arrears—putting in execution all statutes, however obsolete, which created offences punishable by fine or forfeiture; and, in short, by every species of exaction and extortion impoverishing the people, now deprived of the protection of the peerage or of the Church—the latter weakened by the encroachments connived at or prompted by the former, and the peerage, as already alluded to, nearly destroyed by the bloody civil war which had succeeded the age of the “statutes of *præmunire* and provisors.” His successor, Henry VIII., spent the treasure thus accumulated far faster than his father had acquired it. And then he *wanted more*; and the problem was, *where to find it*. The laity, already awfully impoverished, did just what the Commons had done in the reign of Henry IV.; they sought to shift the burden from themselves by imposing it on the Church. And the king readily resorted to the scheme of confiscation which the selfishness of the Commons (*i. e.* the higher and wealthier orders of the laity) suggested, and which Henry IV., usurper as he was, had rejected with scorn. The course of events in this reign towards their final and fatal consummation was but a continuation, however, in

point of principle, of that pursued in previous reigns, and for some time precisely accorded with the precedents they supplied. Just as the Edwards and Henries of the last two centuries had impoverished their treasuries by foolish wars with France, and then sought to replenish them chiefly (with the concurrence of the laity) from the pockets of the clergy, just so it was with Henry VIII. Exactly as Edward I. had done, he demanded of the clergy half their annual income; whereas only five per cent was obtained from the laity. The Convocation resisted for months; but the efforts of Cardinal Wolsey at last succeeded in wringing from them the enormous contribution. Such was the worldly Cardinal's first concession to the Crown. Wolsey—the Beaufort of this reign—was certainly the most magnificent specimen of the class of churchmen to whom it is the purport of these papers to trace the fall of the Church in this country, and his was a character it is impossible to contemplate without a melancholy kind of admiration; while at the same time, in comparing, or rather contrasting such men with such as St. Anselm and St. Thomas, it is as impossible not to perceive the *littleness* of the worldly-minded, courtier-like prelate, who prefers principle to expediency.

There were at the close of the reign of Henry VII., among the Anglican prelates, Fisher and Fox; there was Wareham for a primate, and Wolsey was soon to be legate. All except Fisher (the future martyr to the papal supremacy) held secular offices; and amidst this atmosphere of worldliness Gardiner and Cranmer were imbibing ideas which led both to acknowledge the royal supremacy, therefore to add heresy to schism. Fox and Wareham were, as Wolsey was soon to be, prelates of that *secular* class we have often had occasion to characterise. Fox was privy-seal; Wareham combined the incongruous offices of Archbishop and Chancellor (which St. Thomas would *not* combine); Wolsey was a *royal chaplain*. Fisher was truly a *bishop*; and though revered by the late king as a counsellor, held no secular office. When the present and proximate heads of the English Church were men such as Wareham and Wolsey, the “end could not be far distant.” Wolsey soon relieved Wareham of the chancellorship, and at the early part of the reign of Henry was Archbishop of York, legate, cardinal, chancellor; “farmed” the revenues of Hereford and Worcester; held *in commendam* the abbey of St. Albans and the bishopric of Bath; and afterwards exchanged Bath for Durham, Durham for Winchester. That, in the language of Lingard, if he grasped at wealth, it was not to hoard it but to spend it, is of course matter of small moment

for our purpose, which is to see the effect of all this sort of system on the Church. So far as the country was concerned, at least its present and immediate advantage, we are prepared to say in passing, that the rule of magnificent churchmen, like Beaufort and Wolsey, was far more beneficial to the nation than that of secular persons of the same age; and that as we have seen in the reign of Henry VI., so long as Cardinal Beaufort lived, the country was preserved from the calamities which quickly followed his death, so in the reign of Henry VIII. the death of Wolsey appeared to let in upon the state and the Church a fearful flood of evil. But though his ability had postponed its flow, his example had prepared the way for it—the fatal example of *expediency*. He it was who, to provide for some of his collegiate establishments, *first procured the dissolution of religious houses*; he it was who, as we have just seen, countenanced the unjustifiable imposition on the clergy. How his royal pupil “bettered the example,” all our readers know, and (perhaps happily for him) the Cardinal lived not to see. There is no saying how far his courtly compliance might have carried him; and certainly all his antecedents indicate that he would have afforded a contrast, and not a comparison, to the lofty integrity of Pole. There were in Henry’s reign two English cardinals, Wolsey and Pole; the first would, there is every reason to fear, have *formally* (as he almost did *virtually*) admit the royal supremacy; the other was an illustrious confessor, one might almost say, in the person of his venerable mother, a martyr against it. Well, the first, we have seen, was a pluralist and holder of secular office; the other was a simple *prelate*; never would accept of secular office, and could scarcely ever be induced to sit at the council to give advice to the Crown, so great was his dislike to any concern in temporal matters.

Wolsey died, however, some years before the fatal measure of the royal supremacy; in one sense the inception, in another the consummation of the fearful scheme of the Reformation; its inception in point of actual execution; its consummation in the enunciation of its principle. Let us describe the state of the Church during the interval, in the words of the venerable Fisher, who was destined to protest by martyrdom against the measure. In a synod summoned by the Cardinal, the venerable prelate thus spoke:* “May it not displease your eminence, and the rest of these grave and reverend fathers of the Church, that I say I had thought that when so many learned men had been drawn into this body, that some good matters

* “The Life and Death of the most renowned John Fisher, some time Bishop of Rochester.”

would have been propounded for the benefit of the Church; that the *scandals* which lie so heavy upon her men, and the *disease which takes hold on them*, might have been removed and remedied. But who hath made any proposition against the ambition of those men, whose pride is so offensive, while their profession is humility? How are the goods of the Church wasted! the lands, the tithes, and other oblations of the devout ancestors of the people, expended in superfluous riotous expenses! *How can we expect our flocks to fly the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, when we that are bishops set our minds on nothing more than that which we forbid?* and the people perceive in the same men that preach this doctrine pride and haughtiness of mind, excess in apparel, and a devotion to all worldly pomps and vanities?" "Sundry times when I have settled myself in the care of my flock, to visit my diocese, to govern my church, suddenly there hath come a message to me from the court that I must attend such a triumph, to receive such an ambassador. *What have we to do with princes' courts?* Truly I know not what this *vanity in temporal things* may work in others, but sure I am that in myself it is a great impediment to devotion; and it is high time that we who are the heads should begin to give example to the inferior clergy in these particulars; *for in this course neither can there be likelihood of perpetuity in the same state and condition in which we stand, or safety to the Church.*" No more impressive summary of or commentary on the whole history we have narrated could have been presented than in these remarkable words, which, uttered many years before the commencement of the movement of the Reformation, were also as striking a prophecy as to the future as they were a truthful commentary upon the past.

The quaint old (anonymous) author from whom we have just quoted adds expressively, that "the prelates all seemed by their silence astonished, and the *cardinal's state to become him not so well.*"

If contemporaries, including one so illustrious as the emperor himself, can be credited, it was the worldly-minded ambition of Wolsey, which, by inciting him first to aspire by intrigues with Charles V. and Francis to attain to the Papacy, and then, in order to be revenged on the emperor for his imagined insincerity in the matter, to contrive the ill-starred marriage with Anne Boleyn, and the consequent divorce of Henry from the emperor's aunt, Queen Catherine, laid the foundation or supplied the first temptation to the Reformation. At the outset of the unfortunate affair, however, the Cardinal—again we say happily for himself—was disgraced and

died; affording in his memorable and melancholy exclamation, "Had I served my God as faithfully as I have served my prince, He would not have forsaken me!" a touching epitaph for his tomb, and emphatically characterising the spirit of the system the history of which we are narrating.

The Cardinal had been arraigned on the statute of *præmunire* (of Richard II.) for holding a legatine court; for which he had the express license of the Crown, and against which there was not a pretence for alleging illegality, for reasons we have already alluded to: however, as we have also already intimated, in those days the courts of law construed statutes to mean exactly what the Crown chose; and the words in this particular act, "touching the king, his crown and regalty," were made to admit of any interpretation adapted to the case. The Cardinal, for this reason, had the good sense not to provoke royal anger by a useless struggle, and pleaded guilty, though his death soon after prevented his reaping the result of his prudence. The useful precedent of his prosecution was soon followed with far greater consequences and far deeper designs.

Years before—so did "coming events cast their shadows before"—the Bishop of Paris, a shrewd observer, had predicted that whenever the Cardinal of York should fall into disgrace, the Church of England would suffer spoliation. This prophecy was as remarkable, and even more explicit, and as strikingly verified, as that of the Bishop of Rochester. The very next Parliament, in the very same year of the Cardinal's death, passed the first acts against the See of Rome; in themselves insignificant, except in point of *principle*, and on *that* view ominous precursors of those which were to follow. One of the acts imposed penalties on clergymen who should hold benefices, in violation of a statute against pluralities, under a Papal dispensation or license. That is to say, the statute practically denied that the Pope, as sovereign patron and supreme pastor, had power in any case—whatever might be the reasons in his judgment sufficient—to authorise an arrangement of a purely pastoral character at all at variance with an act of parliament. The pretence of pluralities was plausible; (it was but a *pretence*, for the Papal Constitutions made ample provision against improper pluralities and non-residence :) but the *principle involved* was neither more nor less than this, that the Pope was not supreme head of the Church. It was not so intended or understood; but it serves as a straw thrown up to shew the direction of the wind.

Next year the great event occurred. To get rid of the opposition of the Pope to the divorce, and to pave the way

for the confiscation of Church property, the open assumption of spiritual supremacy had been suggested, and seized at by the king: and the means adopted for making the clergy assent to the monstrous claim were simple and sufficient, and shewed a perfect knowledge on the part of the king of their character. The statute of *præmunire* was made the medium of pecuniary pressure. An absurd "information" was filed against them on that statute, as abettors of the Cardinal in the proceedings under his legatine court. Convocation offered 100,000*l.* for a full pardon. The king declined the offer, *although much in want of money*. The reason is clear: he knew the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy was worth far more than ten times 100,000*l.* to him; that it, in fact, put the whole Anglican Church and all her property utterly at his mercy, and cut the knot of all questions with the Holy See; and made him, in short, as absolute in Church as he already was in State. Under the weak, worldly-minded presidency of Archbishop Wareham, who had survived his supplanter Wolsey, (and survived, alas, the Church of which he had been consecrated Primate!) the royal supremacy was affirmed, with the addition of words ("so far as the law of Christ allows") which really were only a subterfuge; since, as Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, (who, except Fisher of Rochester, was the only prelate who had the courage to oppose the blasphemous proposal,) unanswerably urged, if the claim meant no more than that the king was *head in temporals*, why did he not *say so*? And accordingly the useless addition was soon discarded by the king, and the naked acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy extorted and *acted upon*.

How and for what *purpose* it was acted on, we are anxious should be especially observed. Throughout the remainder of the reign no other alteration was effected in the national faith. The principle had not, then, been established for *spiritual* purposes. During a whole reign this great principle lay practically *dormant* so far as the *faith* was concerned; since although Henry repeatedly used his new prerogative of spiritual supremacy, it was in protecting or enforcing, not in *changing*, the rest of the Catholic faith. More than one reason makes it important to remark this. We may observe in passing, that it totally destroys the Anglican theory (or fiction) of the Reformation, that the Anglican Church synodically, and with due, deliberate "synodical action," "reformed" the formularies of her faith, and so forth. The plain fact is, that she had—years before any change in the liturgy or formularies of faith—*given up all power over them*, and bound herself hand and foot under the iron yoke of the spiritual supremacy of the Crown; and

that this was not a voluntary and conscientious rejection of the papal supremacy, but was plainly extorted from the Church by threats of confiscation, and *against their consciences*; and that many years afterwards—by this prerogative of spiritual supremacy so conceded, *contrary to conscience*,—the *sovereign* reformed the formularies of the faith, and in reality changed the faith, by the sole power of the State. For our present purpose, however, it is more pertinent to observe, that the real reason why the king had extorted the confession of his spiritual supremacy was, that he might use it not for spiritual purposes (except for the temporary purpose of the marriage), but for *temporal*. Undoubtedly, *but* for the marriage he might not have troubled himself with the theological prerogative, but have availed himself of the plainer precedents of his predecessors, and simply seized, as Edward I. once did, the possessions of the monasteries or of the churches for his own use. This would have been, after all, only a development of the statutes of provisors; for those acts prevented the Church from *controlling her own property*; and there would be consistency, after that, in *taking it away*. To get rid of a marriage, however, it was requisite to assume the *spiritual*; while, on the other hand, the assumption was an unerring means to the other end, the confiscation of Church property. Hitherto we have seen the Crown in its pursuit of the temporal possessions of the Church indirectly; and, except for that purpose, unintentionally affecting her spiritual powers. Now we have the Crown avowedly, and more consistently, claiming that same spiritual supremacy which had long been, though not virtually, at all events impliedly, if not assumed by itself, at least limited or restrained in the Holy See. The statute of the royal supremacy confirming the decree of convocation was the consummation of this assumption, and in principle the consummation of the Reformation. It is not necessary for our present purpose to trace out the gradual development of the principle through all the multiform and fluctuating phases of error which the Reformation assumed in the course of the century in which it was carried out, or of the two centuries succeeding, in which, even up to our own time, the ultimate *results* and real character of that principle have been by degrees elucidated even to the most incredulous. This would afford ample matter for attention. But our present purpose is to shew how the unqualified assumption of the royal supremacy was the natural and logical development of the principles and premisses we have disclosed, as admitted by the Anglican Church in preceding reigns, particularly from the time of the statutes of “provisors” and *præmunire*. It will have been remarked that

the statutes of *præmunire* were the weapons made use of to coerce the clergy into the acknowledgment of the royal supremacy. And they were themselves, we have shewn, a rapid and natural result of the statutes of provisors, and these again but the formal legislative expression of a principle long previously acted upon, that the endowment of the Church gave the Crown and laity a *right* to limit the pastoral power of her Supreme Pastor, by interposing certain "claims" of *nomination* and *presentment*, on their part, as paramount and precedent to the exercise of the power of her supreme pastorship; in short, that the temporal property was more important than the spiritual "see" or cure of souls to which it was attached, but which must be considered secondary, subordinate, and subservient. In a word, that the *temporal must be supreme over the spiritual*.

And what is this but the principle of the royal supremacy in the bud, in the germ, unperceived, unacknowledged to exist, but nevertheless *there*, in all its poisonous essence and its pernicious influence, destined in due time to develope and put forth its flowers and fatal fruit. That time had now arrived; the soil of the Church was rank, and had ripened the fruit to perfection, and the king now gathered it. If the papal supremacy might be indirectly fettered and interfered with for the sake of protecting supposed temporal rights, why not directly for the same purpose? And if the Crown or the State could so fetter and interfere with it, then must the secular power be superior to the spiritual; and if so, then the assumption of the royal supremacy was natural, logical, and consistent, nay *necessary*. This will be made more plain by an example or two, illustrative of the way in which the principle was now put into practice for temporal purposes.

All along we have shewn that the assertion and admission of this principle in its first germ alike arose from *sordid* motives; the mere *love of money*, which has ever been the "root of all evil." That this motive equally incited the Crown to seek to encroach on the temporal rights of the Church, and with that view to encroach on the papal supremacy; and also incited the higher orders of the clergy, more or less, to support the Crown for the sake of preserving or procuring ecclesiastical preferment; and lastly, induced the laity to side with the Crown equally against the Holy See and against the clergy, to cast on the Church as much as possible of the burdens of the state, and so protect their own pockets. And this "wretched interchange of wrong for wrong," this sordid *reaction* of selfish motives, will be clearly seen in the catastrophe of the religious houses, that first fruit of the royal supremacy,

that first stage in Church spoliation; which also will amply illustrate, by comparison with the transactions of previous reigns, the close connexion between the present and the past, and the identity of the principles involved.

It will be remembered that in noticing the reigns of the Edwards and Henries, we have remarked that with respect to Church property, the acts passed in those reigns might have supplied Henry VIII. with some useful precedents. We deferred a full explanation of our meaning, which is, that the *principles* asserted or implied in those statutes really involved a right of the Crown to do all that Henry now did. An act of Edward I. recites (in language similar to that of the statute of provisors as to benefices and bishoprics) that monasteries, priories, and other religious houses, were founded (*i. e.* endowed) by the king's progenitors, and the ancestors of the nobles of his realm, and lands and tenements given to them, to the intent that clerks and laymen might be admitted to them, and sick and feeble men maintained, and almsgiving, and hospitality, and other charitable deeds done therein, and prayers said for the souls of the said founders: and then the statute enacts that the religious houses should not send any money out of the country at the order of their superiors abroad, with a proviso that "it is not the meaning of the king to exclude the superiors from executing their office of visitation," so that they did not carry out of his kingdom any money as treasure. Now here, although the purview of the act is temporal, yet it shews an utter disregard of any indirect encroachment on the spiritual that might ensue from it. It certainly implies the very principle we pointed out as implied in the similar recital of the statute of provisors, that because the ancestors of the "king and his nobles" endowed the bishoprics and benefices and religious houses, the right of seeing to the due discharge of the duties belonging to them, and of the intentions of the founders, was in the Crown and Parliament, instead of in the Pope; a principle actually tantamount to this, that the moment endowment takes place, the royal is substituted for the papal supremacy. This consequence was doubtless not contemplated; but the principle is implied, and will be found slowly and insidiously developing itself from time to time. Thus, in the reign of Henry V. another statute passed on the subject of religious houses, reciting in very similar terms to those of the former one, "that forasmuch as many hospitals had been founded by the kings of this realm, and lords spiritual and temporal, to the honour of God and his glorious Mother, in aid and merit of the souls of the said founders, to which hospitals the said founders have given a

great part of their goods and lands; it is ordained, that as to the hospitals which are of the *patronage of the king*, the ordinaries, *by virtue of the king's commission* to them to be directed, shall *inquire of the governance and state of the said hospitals.*" Now the principle is here plainly put forth, that over all religious houses or bishoprics or benefices endowed by the Crown at any period, the Crown, and *not the Holy See*, had *supreme right of visitation!* What remained, then, for Henry VIII. but to put into practice this principle? He did so; and but for the matter of the marriage, probably would not have cared to *assume* the spiritual supremacy, however much it was *implied* in the principle thus enunciated, or in proceedings putting it in practice. And this is not the less so, notwithstanding that so little was the principle *understood* to be implied, that the predecessor of Henry V. rejected with scorn a scheme for putting it in force, which Henry VIII. eagerly resorted to.

And the scheme was suggested by the minister who had suggested the assumption of the royal supremacy, and who suggested it chiefly for the sordid purposes of plunder. Cromwell, the author of the scheme, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and had to provide funds for his master's dissipation, and on *his* part the assumption of the supremacy was designed as a preliminary to Church spoliation; not the less necessary, in his cunning apprehension, because the principle was logically implied in acts already passed. Logical implication he knew was one thing; national apprehension another; and therefore he had the supremacy *affirmed* by convocation and Parliament to be in the Crown, and then who could exclaim against its being put in force?

It *was* so; and in the course of sacrilegious spoliation which ensued, it is wretched to remark the same sordid system of subservient *connivance* going on in the Church, of which we have all along traced the disastrous consequences, the cause and consequences of deep-seated corruption. The abbots and priors acquiesced in the spoliation of the *smaller* houses; the bishops and secular clergy in the spoliation of the larger; the laity (at least the higher classes) in the plunder of all; and all alike for the sake of conciliating the favour of the Crown, and being considered *loyal*. But let it not be overlooked, that before the English Church was spoiled, she had as a body consented to a measure of spoliation upon the Holy See; and not merely had parliament, comprising the *bishops and abbots*, abolished the papal supremacy, but passed acts depriving the Holy See of rights it had possessed from time immemorial, and as much sanctioned by law as the possession of their own

temporal endowments. The Anglican Church, then, as a body, not less than each class comprised within her, received in ensuing rapine a rich retribution. Having concurred with the Crown in a sacrilegious sacrifice of the rights of the Holy See, the Crown sacrificed them also in their turn. And when, long after, they repented, it was *too late*; the season of repentance, at least of reparation, was gone, although "they sought it carefully with tears." The nation did not unlearn the lesson they had taught so quickly as the teachers, and having once tasted the sweets of plunder, thirsted, tiger-like, for more; a thirst not satiated until slaked in the desolation of the State and the blood of their sovereign.

Let us take another example to illustrate the truth we are anxious to establish, that the Anglican Church, by conceding measures detrimental, however indirectly, to the papal supremacy, laid the foundation of the Reformation.

When Henry had obtained from convocation the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy, he proceeded, putting it consistently in force, to demand from them their solemn engagement never to enact any constitution without the royal authority and assent, and to submit all now in force to a commission to be chosen by the Crown. They remonstrated, but durst not resist. How should they? Why, their predecessors had conceded the principle two centuries before, when they assented to certain statutes of *præmunire*, providing that no bulls or instruments of the Pope which the Crown or the lay courts chose to consider touched the regalty of the realm,—in other words, interfered with state-craft, or court corruption, or lay patronage, or the right of presentment, or by whatever other name might be designated the sordid system of *traffic* in benefices and bishoprics,—ought not by law to be introduced into the country; that is to say, the Anglican Church had thus declared that the Crown, and not the Holy See, was the supreme judge as to what bulls should be published, or what sentences of excommunication pronounced, by the Pope. And after having assented to *this*, how idle and absurd to assume for *themselves* a greater authority than they had admitted to their head, the Vicar of Christ, the supreme Pastor of the Church! If *he* was to submit to the secular power, why should not *they*? The Anglicans of those days were really almost as inconsistent as the Anglicans of ours.

We have seen what kind of men had supported the Crown all along, and connived at its successive encroachments on the Church; to the last they were the same. From such as Folliot in the reign of Henry VI., to such as Wareham or Wolsey in the reign of Henry VIII., they were *men of the*

world, men fond of the world, and so moved by worldly motives of *expediency*; men who cared more to be thought *loyal* subjects of the Crown than consistent children of the Holy See; men who cared for what the Crown could give,—worldly possessions and honours, power, place, pre-eminence, and reputation. What can be wanted to prove our proposition, for which we have all along contended, that worldliness is identical with indifference; that care for the things of the world is inconsistent with care for the things of the Church; that to be subservient to the Crown where the Church is concerned, it is impossible to be faithful to the Church, and requires men to be attached to what the Crown can give. But the same conclusion is established as clearly by reversing the inquiry, and observing who were they who *resisted* these encroachments, and remained faithful to the Church and the Holy See. Only those who *cared not for the world*: seculars like the saintly Fisher (very few of them, alas!), or religious, who observed consistently the rule of poverty and the principle of detachment from the world. While the courtly bishops and abbots and priors, the lords of parliament, were easily assenting to and enacting the royal supremacy, the severe religious orders, the Carthusians and the “Observantines” (Franciscans), especially the last, were every where preaching against it; and while Feckenham, the rich Abbot of Westminster, was, as a lord of the Council, endeavouring along with Cromwell (fit companion truly for the superior of a religious house in such a work!) to seduce or intimidate More into an assent to the king’s blasphemous assumption, the monks of the Charter-House were hung for denying it, and the *entire Observantine order were expelled the country*;—a noble and memorable distinction they earned by the most uncompromising opposition to the unscrupulous monarch and his unprincipled parliament. And what was the secret? The Franciscan prior Peyto told it when, in answer to a brutal threat of Cromwell’s, he replied with a smile, “Threaten such things to rich and dainty folk, *which are clothed in purple, fare deliciously, and have their chiefest hopes in this world. We esteem them not. We are joyful that for the discharge of our duty we are driven hence.*”

And now we must close. In truth, our task is done. It was simply to trace to the doors of these rich and dainty folk, who “had their chiefest hopes in this world,” and so of course were courteous and “conciliatory” towards it, that blasphemous exaltation of the royal over the papal supremacy, which was in order of *time* the inception, in order of *principle* the *consummation* of the Reformation; and to shew that the character and conduct of those who in past ages connived at the

encroachments of that secular power, which ever thus “exalteth itself against God,” exactly accord with the character and conduct of those who, in our own age, encourage the Crown to set up still more monstrous claims—(more monstrous, seeing that of old the Crown had at least the pretence of *endowments*), whose conduct has always been worldly and corrupt, and whose character was depicted, by Him who “knew what was in man,” in these simple words—“they loved the praise of men, and sought honour one of another, and not the honour that cometh from God.”

Reviews.

NEWMAN'S LECTURES ON THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND.

Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England: addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory. By John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri. Burns and Lambert.

IT is no exaggeration, but the bare truth, to assert that the sentiments entertained by Protestants towards the Catholic Church are inexplicable, except on the supposition that Catholicism is from God. It is impossible to analyse these sentiments, to trace them through their various ramifications, to witness their practical results, and to note the fact that they are totally without parallel in the views held by the numerous sects of non-Catholics towards one another, and not come to the conclusion that something more than man inspires their undying animosity against us. They would grant themselves, indeed, that this animosity *is* more than human in its origin, and claim for it a divine authorship. But not to put forward the impossibility of a divine authorship for a state of mind compounded of a wilful ignorance of facts, a deliberate repetition of falsehoods, and a savage hatred of millions upon millions of their fellow-creatures,—the Protestant view cannot be a divinely inspired abhorrence of error and sin, because it co-exists with the extremest laxity of judgment towards the errors and sins of all those who are not Catholics.

The anti-Catholic spirit is, in truth, as we have said, without a parallel upon earth. The abhorrence of Protestants towards Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans, is in comparison a fraternal affection; the Protestant “denominations,” fiercely

as they are opposed when their peculiar interests happen to clash, are gentle in their wildest attacks on each other, in contrast with the hatred with which *at all times* they view the Catholic Church. This hatred possesses men and women of every temper and age. The mother forgets her love for her child, the father abhors his own flesh and blood, the friend turns round to slander the beloved companion of half his life, the tender heart that shrinks from crushing a worm cries out for extermination, imprisonment, and even blood. Reason with them, they call you a Jesuit; conciliate them, they throw your kindness back into your face; be patient, and you are a sneaking coward; be courageous, and you are a seditious rebel; cling to your poverty, and you are a filthy beggar; be prudent in managing your means, and you are purchasing souls; if you prove any thing, you prove too much; if you leave truth to do its own work unsupported, you have nothing to say; if you are not a fool, you are a knave; if you are not a knave, you are a fool; you *ought* to be, you *must* be, you *shall* be, every thing that is false, impure, deceitful, treacherous, and diabolical, and therefore you *are* all this.

What is it that we shew to Protestants that, if one half of what they say of us is true, the other half *must be* false; that we only ask to be heard in our defence; that we shew that Catholic kingdoms, and Catholic families, and Catholic societies, could not exist for an hour, if Catholicism were what they assert it to be? They have already determined that we are guilty; they count it a mockery and an insult to their understandings to listen to us. To extenuate Catholicism is like proving the multiplication-table false. The thing is absurd. Our proofs, our arguments, our facts, are but illustrations of our ingenuity in wickedness; our appeals to their good feelings, to their common sense, to their personal experience, are so many traps for the seducing the unwary. "*I hate Catholicism and Catholics,*" cries the Protestant, "and there is an end of it."

All this, then, we say, is sufficiently intelligible on the supposition that the Catholic faith is from God, and that the natural heart of man revolts from the allegiance it owes to God, while it is incessantly worked upon and led astray by a supernatural agency which devotes all its energies to the blinding of men's eyes to the truth of God's words. Grant this, and the mysterious phenomenon is explained. The perennial frenzy of man against the Church is nothing more than the passionate resistance of the rebellious soul to the divine power, whose sway it dreads, under the secret influence of the devil himself.

And hence, further, if we ourselves would meet this opposition aright, it is of the first importance that we never for a moment forget its true nature, or essay to overcome it by weapons which are adapted for a contest with men in a rational frame of mind. If the Protestant view is, as we maintain, so senseless, so mad, so selfish, so atheistic, so utterly satanic in its origin, it is plainly a mere waste of time to adopt a line of conduct based on the supposition that it is nothing more than ignorance which arrays our foes against us; that Protestants desire to do us justice; that they can be won over by conciliation, by compromise, or by the concealment of the more obnoxious of our dogmas and practices. It is not this or that doctrine which scandalises them; it is not that they have had no opportunities of learning our true creed; it is not that they are prepared to act on the principles of plain dealing, and what they call their English love of fair play; they do not *desire* to know the truth about us; they have surrendered themselves to a bondage to their passions and to Satan; they keep their tenderness and honourableness for themselves and for the affairs of this world; for us there is neither mercy nor justice.

Of course, we do not mean that there are *no* exceptions to this rule. Yet they are few, and scattered here and there. Nor do we mean that we are to neglect any opportunity for removing prejudices and instructing the ignorant, when there is a fair chance of success. What we think is, that the best way to convince Protestants of their foolishness and errors is to force the truth upon them as it is, and to leave Almighty God to bring it home to their *consciences*. *We* cannot counteract the machinations, without which human hostility would be a trifle. *We* cannot meet Satan in the secret chambers of the soul, and oppose our reasonings to his suggestions. The grace of God alone can do this; and it is our firm conviction that the grace of God *does* this most bountifully, when we place our whole dependence upon grace for victory, and lay aside all hope of conquest from acting on the natural good sense, amiableness, and fairness of men. Surely we have all of us enough to do without going out of our way, and wasting our time in profitless controversy with persons who shew not the slightest desire to know what is true. Surely the simplest and the most accomplished Catholic alike have before them a boundless choice of good deeds to which they may betake themselves, *with a certain prospect of doing great good*, instead of throwing away their energies and their personal comfort in encounters with an enemy who cares nothing for the laws of honourable warfare, and who desires only one thing,—our utter extermination from the face of the earth.

The hopelessness of any attempt to conciliate the goodwill of Protestants (of course, as we have said, with exceptions) will be still further manifest when we examine into the actual *opinion* they entertain regarding the Catholic Church. Considering what they *think* of Catholics, we can hardly wonder at the malevolence of their temper towards us. It is nothing that their view is irrational, baseless, and even monstrous in the extreme; all this matters not, so long as they hold it. In truth, the very fact that it *is* so incredibly preposterous and silly, is a proof that it is something more than a common popular error. The belief in so palpable a series of falsehoods as those which Protestants from generation to generation believe respecting Catholics, *can* come but from one source; and coming from that source, it is clear that no mere human instrumentality can avail to dissipate it.

This opinion, then, is twofold; it is compounded of a conviction of our falsehood and a conviction of our power. Marvellous as it seems, it may be said with truth that there are few Protestants to be found who do not, more or less, share in the idea that the whole Catholic priesthood are leagued together, as conscious deceivers, for the purpose of enslaving the bodies and souls of mankind. The Catholic laity are supposed to be, for the most part, their deluded instruments or their secret foes. But whether the laity share in the organisation or not, the Protestant mind is unceasingly haunted by the belief that deception is the very soul of Catholicism. Here may be an honest priest; there may be a zealous, upright, and educated layman; *this* act may be undeniably straightforward; *that* prayer may be uttered from an unfeigned heart;—all these, thinks Protestantism, are but the exceptions; there must be deceit *somewhere*; and that deceit is the whole secret of the existence of Popery. You may not be able to trace it out in this or that individual case; you may be baulked when you would lay your finger on this or that detected lie; this is but the result of the superhuman *craft* of Popery; it is its masterpiece, that it *cannot* be proved wrong. If the laity are honest, then the priests are the tricksters; if the parish priests are honest, then it is the bishops who are working the jugglery; if the bishops are blameless, it is the monks who are the accomplished adepts; if the monks, again, are deceived and not deceivers, then it *must* be the Pope; and if the Pope, poor man, is, after all, more sinned against than sinning, why there are the Jesuits at the bottom of it all.

We are confident that we are not exaggerating the fact when we say that, more or less, with some few exceptions, this notion of the existence of some mysterious instrument of de-

ception in the Catholic Church has possession of English Protestants of every rank, save perhaps the poorest. The most enlightened, the most candid, the most charitable, the most Catholic in feeling, come under its portentous sway. We appeal to those who, having been educated as Protestants, have submitted in after life to the Church, for confirmation of the truth of what we say. Admitting great differences of degree, undoubtedly, they will bear their testimony to the almost universal existence of this suspicion of our good faith. They once shared it themselves; it required not merely a resolute effort, and an opening of the eyes to facts, but long-continued familiarity with Catholicism in order to shake it off. Whence it came, they could not tell; on what ground it rested, they could not point out; even when they had learnt to perceive its absurdity, and strove to cast it from them, still it clung to them, and haunted them, and whispered "Beware!" until at length, by the grace of God, and the knowledge of facts, and the intimate perception of the reality of Catholic uprightness and simplicity, they became so habituated to the truth, as to think an imputation of deception to the Catholic system about as rational an idea, as the belief that the six-and-twenty "bishops" of the Establishment are leagued together for the promotion of one and the same theological creed.

Combined with this amazing infatuation, there exists in the Protestant mind an indescribable dread of the power of the Church. *Why* their boasted age of reason should have any thing to fear from any thing so irrational as Popery, they fail to state; *why* some hundreds of millions of human beings should voluntarily surrender themselves as slaves to a few thousand priests, a few hundred Jesuits, or a single Pope, they forget to reflect; *how* it is that Irish kitchen-maids are to bring mischief into British households; *who* it is that is to light the Smithfield fires, burn the Protestant Bibles, control the administration of justice, bribe the members of parliament, take a seat at the cabinet councils of the Queen, alter the Protestant succession, or cause the Majesty of England herself some morning to awake and find herself a Papist; by whom, or how, these miracles are to be accomplished, shuddering Protestantism disdains to inquire. Unreflecting, uninquiring, it knows only how to tremble. As the fowls of the air droop their wings and flee to their coverts before the coming tempest, long before the senses of men can detect its approach, so the flocks of Protestantism snuff the gale with angry aspect, the moment the very sound of Popery is borne upon the breeze.

Yes; and indeed with reason! There *is* a secret which

is the life of the Church ; there *is* a power that she wields, which, when it is put forth, can sweep away the myriads of her enemies, as the thunder-blast strews the hills and valleys with the prostrate birds of the air. That secret is the possession of the word of God ; that power is his omnipotent grace ! Let them fear, then, and be afraid, and feel their blood run cold, when even a whisper from the Vatican disturbs the repose of their island sky. There is One upon the earth whom they know not ; One who made the heavens, and who can unmake the handiwork of Luther and Elizabeth ; and before whose breath, when it shall please Him to send it forth upon them, they, and their laws, and their tyranny, and their hatred, shall flee, and be seen no more !

Meanwhile, *our* path is clear. What avails it to reason with men who are incapable of reasoning rightly ? What can disturb the complacency of men who reject all proof, on the ground that the cogency of our arguments is only a proof of our preternatural skill in deception ? Why waste our breath on men who are convinced that the worse *is* the better reason when Popery is concerned ? Let us hope nothing from Protestant candour, but every thing from the almighty power of God, blessing the instrument which He has appointed, viz. the simple, bold, persevering setting forth of unadulterated Catholic truth before the eyes of all men.

We cannot too strongly express our conviction that a recognition of this great truth is of primary importance in our intercourse with the Protestant world. Apologies, framed on a kind of supposition that Protestantism is a tribunal before which Catholicism is summoned to exculpate itself from grievous charges ; controversies, in which Catholic doctrines are proved (?) on Protestant grounds ; appeals to English justice, to the natural kind feelings of the heart, to men's love of truth ; all these, and such as these, we regard as worse than useless ; *of course, with exceptions*. There is but one safe, wise, and successful mode of carrying on the warfare ; and that is, to remember that it *is* a warfare ; that we are the soldiers of Almighty God ; that we are bound to be assailants, and not mere defenders ; and that we must fight with the weapons which our Captain has placed in our hands. There is but one alternative before us—disgraceful defeat, *or* victory.

Such, then, being, as we conceive, the true statement of the case between Catholics and Protestants, our first work will be, as Father Newman happily expresses it, to *reconnoitre* the enemy's camp, and ascertain his mode of fighting. And this Father Newman has himself done for us, in his lectures recently delivered at Birmingham, with a precision, a clearness

and width of view, and a felicity of statement, unrivalled by any other writer on the tactics of Protestantism. The work, viewed with reference to the author's object, is as completely successful, and as thoroughly practical, as any which has yet proceeded from Father Newman's pen. That Protestants, indeed, should do it justice, cannot be expected. It is no pleasant thing, even for a generous foe, to see the incredible follies, and treacheries, and malice of his own supporters, exposed with a quiet truthfulness and penetrating force, which leaves it doubtful whether Protestantism is more wicked or more absurd. Priggish and puritanical, too, as is the English mind in general, we do not doubt that many are the phrases of grave displeasure, and preternaturally portentous the dignified frowns, with which various classes of Father Newman's readers will lament over certain portions of his lectures. That "Sunday religionism," which is the characteristic of every attempt at religiousness outside the true Church, and which renders our misbelieving countrymen unable to conceive how a man can be really serious who in religious things intermingles food for laughter with food for tears, will feel itself doubly outraged when *itself* is the object of the satirist's arrows. Far, indeed, is Father Newman from ridiculing any thing that is really an object of religious regard by the most mistaken of misbelievers. No man has ever shewn himself more tender of every thing that bears the slightest claim to respect and mercy. It is those monstrous exhibitions of perverseness, folly, and crime, *which Protestants themselves profess to condemn*, at which he strikes without sparing, and which they would be the first to denounce, were they not blinded by that spirit of infatuation which is at once the curse and the safeguard of semi-conscientious heresy.

That the lectures, nevertheless, will do great good to Protestants, we have little doubt. Some they will silence, to some they will teach caution, some they will compel to think, and many they will prepare for a reception of those divine truths which it is not the *direct* object of these lectures to establish. For once the Protestant world will be astonished to find itself treated *as manifestly in the wrong*. For once it will be made to feel that it is on the defensive; and that in the eyes of Catholics Protestantism wears the aspect of folly, as well as that of heresy. For once it will have some slight sense of that moral and intellectual humiliation, of which it would be always conscious, could it see itself as we see it.

The apparent literary merit of the several lectures naturally varies according to the subject, and different Catholic readers will appreciate them differently, according to the personal in-

terest they feel in the special subject which the lecturer may be particularly handling. The opening lecture we think the least successful of the whole, the ingenious application with which it commences being worked out at too great length, though with a charming felicity of language and illustration. The imaginary speech, at the termination of the same lecture, also strikes us as the only weak passage of any length in the volume. At the same time, the true character of the Protestant view of Catholicism is brought out with singular force and accuracy. That view is what we commonly call *conventional*. It is like the view of a landscape which a man gets by putting on a pair of blood-red spectacles. Protestants never look at us with a clear, straightforward vision. They start with an *idea* of us, with a *view*, which distorts and discolours every object, so that all seems at once monstrous and bloody. If they hear of Brahminism, or Mahometanism, or Mormonism, or mesmerism, or of Californian or Australian gold, or of the old Greeks and Romans, or of their next-door neighbours who are not Catholics, or of Methodists, or of railway speculations, or of any other conceivable object on earth, to a certain extent they fairly *look at* the subject before them; they ask for facts; they do not start by assuming that they knew all about it from their cradles. But in our case the "view" is every thing. The trees in the landscape are not green, the sky is not blue, buildings are not upright, men and beasts do not walk upon their feet; the distorting, fiery medium turns all into deformity and blood.

"The simple notion," says Father Newman, "of most people is, that Christianity was very pure in its beginning, very corrupt in the middle age, and very pure in England now, though still corrupt every where else; that in the middle age a tyrannical institution, called the Church, arose and swallowed up Christianity; and that Church is alive still, and has not yet disgorged its prey, except, as aforesaid, in our own favoured country: but in the middle age there was no Christianity any where at all, but all was dark and horrible, as bad as paganism, or rather much worse. No one knew any thing about God, or whether there was a God or no, nor about Christ nor his atonement; for the blessed Virgin, and saints, and the Pope, and images, were worshipped instead; and thus, so far from religion benefiting the generations of mankind who lived in that dreary time, it did them indefinitely more harm than good. * * *

"So much for the middle ages; next I will take an instance of modern times. If there is any set of men in the whole world who are railed against as the pattern of all that is evil, it is the Jesuit body. It is vain to ask their slanderers what they know of them: did they ever see a Jesuit? can they say whether they are many or few? what do they know of their teaching? 'Oh, it is quite notorious,' they reply; 'you might as well deny the sun in heaven; it

is notorious that the Jesuits are a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men; a secret society, ever plotting against liberty, and government, and progress, and thought, and the prosperity of England. Nay, it is awful; they disguise themselves in a thousand shapes, as men of fashion, farmers, soldiers, labourers, butchers, and pedlars; they prowl about with handsome stocks, and stylish waistcoats, and gold chains about their persons, or in fustian jackets, as the case may be; and they do not hesitate to shed the blood of any one whatever, prince or peasant, who stands in their way."

"How, then," replies the more reasoning Protestant, "if this view is absolutely false, how comes it to exist at all? There *must* be a cause for so universal a feeling. Account for it, I say, on any other supposition than its substantial justice. We can supply a history, a rationale, of every other universal belief; do this, Catholic controversialists, in your own case, and point out how the Protestant view was born, and how it lives, on your own hypothesis that it is a false view."

To such a supposed questioner, Father Newman commences his reply in the second lecture; and here all the brightness of his powers of observation and analysis shines out. "I say," he replies (though we are not quoting his very words), "that the Protestant view is a *tradition*, of which I can point out the birth, the parentage, the motives of its authors, the means they took to propagate it, and the elements in human nature which they employed for the purpose of ensuring it a long life, and upon which it still exists and thrives."

"Englishmen," to turn to Father Newman's own expressions, "entertain their present monstrous notions of us mainly because those notions are received on information, not authenticated, but immemorial. This it is that makes them entertain those notions: they talk much of free inquiry, but towards us they do not dream of practising it; they have been taught what they hold in the nursery, in the schoolroom, in the lecture-class, from the pulpit, in the newspaper, in society. Each man teaches the other: 'How do *you* know it?' 'Because *he* told me;' 'And how does *he* know it?' 'Because *I* told *him*;' or, at very best advantage, 'We both know it because it was so said when we were young; because no one ever said the contrary; because I recollect what a noise, when I was young, the Catholic Relief Bill made; because my father and the old clergyman said so, and Lord Eldon, and George the Third; and there was Mr. Pitt obliged to give up office, and Lord George Gordon, long before that, made a riot, and the Catholic chapels were burned down all over the country.' Well, these are your grounds for knowing it; and how did those energetic Protestants whom you have mentioned know it themselves? Why, they were told by others before them, and those others by others again a great time back;

and there the telling and teaching is lost in fog : and this is mainly what has to be said for the anti-Catholic notions in question. Now this is to believe on *tradition*."

This tradition was established and nationalised by Queen Elizabeth and her supporters. Henry VIII. created it ; but to his daughter and her cunning government it owes its permanence. How they did this, and how the affairs of the world fell in with their schemes, Father Newman shews in his happiest manner. The sagacious intellects who were the ruling spirits of the English Reformation, he says,

"Had to deal with a people who would be sure to revolt from the unnatural speculations of Calvin, and who would see nothing attractive in the dreamy and sensual doctrines of Luther. The emptiness of a ceremonial and the affectation of a priesthood were no bribe to its business-like habits and its love of the tangible. Definite dogma, intelligible articles, formularies which would construe, a consistent ritual, an historical ancestry, would have been thrown away on those who were not sensitive of the connexion of faith and reason. Another way was to be pursued with our countrymen to make Protestantism live ; and that was, to embody it in the person of its sovereign. English Protestantism is the religion of the throne : it is represented, realised, taught, transmitted in the succession of monarchs and an hereditary aristocracy. It is a religion grafted upon loyalty ; and its strength is not in argument, not in fact, not in the unanswerable controversialist, not in an apostolical succession, not in sanction of Scripture, but in a royal road to faith, in backing up a king whom men see, against a Pope they do not see. The devolution of its crown is the tradition of its creed ; and to doubt its truth is to be disloyal towards its sovereign. Kings are an Englishman's saints and doctors ; he likes somebody or something at which he can cry 'huzzah,' and throw up his hat. Bluff King Hal, glorious Bess, the Royal Martyr, the Merry Monarch, the pious and immortal William, the good King George, royal personages very different from each other,—nevertheless, as being royal, none of them come amiss, but all are the objects of his devotion, and the resolution of his Christianity.

"It was plain, then, what had to be done in order to perpetuate Protestantism in a country such as this. Convoke the legislature, pass some sweeping ecclesiastical enactments, exalt the Crown above the law and the gospel, down with the cross and up with the lion and dog, toss all priests out of the country as traitors, let Protestantism be the passport to office and authority, force the king to be a Protestant, make his court Protestant, bind Houses of Parliament to be Protestant, clap a Protestant oath on judges, barristers-at-law, officers in army and navy, members of the universities, national clergy ; establish this stringent tradition in every function and department of the state, surround it with the lustre of rank, wealth, station, name, and talent ; and this people, so impatient of inquiry, so care-

less of abstract truth, so apathetic to historical fact, so contemptuous of foreign ideas, will *ex animo* swear to the truth of a religion which indulges their natural turn of mind, and involves no severe thought or tedious application. The sovereign is the source and the centre, as of civil, so of ecclesiastical arrangements; truth shall be synonymous with order and good government;—what can be simpler than such a teaching? Puritans may struggle against it, and temporarily prevail; sceptics may ridicule it, object, expose, and refute; readers of the Fathers may strive to soften and embellish it with the colours of antiquity; but strong in the constitution of the law, and congenial to the heart of the people, the royal tradition will be a match for all its rivals, and in the long-run will extinguish the very hope of competition.

“So counselled the Ahithophels of the day; it was devised, it was done.”

The most potent of the external causes which aided the Elizabethans, the lecturer thus describes. Its influence over educated men and women, *down to this very hour*, probably few can estimate, except those who have been for a time seduced by its fascinations.

“Protestantism became, not only the tradition of law and of good society, but the tradition of literature also. There is no English literature before the age of Elizabeth; but with the latter years of her reign begins that succession of great authors which continues to flow on down to this day. So it was that about the commencement of the sixteenth century learning revived; on the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, the men of letters of the imperial city, and, what was of more consequence, its libraries, became the property of the West. Schools were opened for the cultivation of studies and pursuits, which make Greece as renowned among the nations in the gifts of intellect, as Judea has been in the gifts of grace. The various perfections of the Greek language, the treasures of Greek thought, the genius and taste of Greek art, after the sleep of ages, burst upon the European mind. It was like the warmth, the cheerfulness, and the hues of spring succeeding to the pure and sublime, but fantastic forms of winter frost-work. The barbarism, the sternness, the untowardness of the high and noble mediæval school, eyed with astonishment, and melted beneath, the radiance of a genius unrivalled in the intellectual firmament. A world of ideas, transcendent in beauty and endless in fertility, flooded the imagination of the scholar and the poet. The fine arts underwent a classical development, and the vernacular tongues caught the refinement and the elegance of the age of Pericles and Alexander. The revival began in Catholic Italy; it advanced into Catholic France; at length it shewed itself in Protestant England. A voice came forth from the grave of the old world, as articulate and keen as that of a living teacher; and it thrilled into the heart of the people to whom it came, and it taught them to respond to it in their own tongue,—and that teaching was coincident.

with the first preaching of Protestantism. It was surely a most lucky accident for the young religion, that, while the English language was coming to the birth with its special attributes of nerve, simplicity, and vigour, at its very first breathings Protestantism was at hand to form it upon its own theological *patois*, and to educate it as the mouth-piece of its tradition. So, however, it was to be; and soon,

‘As in this bad world below
Noblest things find vilest using,’

the new religion employed the new language for its purposes in a great undertaking, the translation of its own Bible; a work which, by the purity of its diction and the strength and harmony of its style, has deservedly become the very model of good English, and the standard of the language to all future times. The same age, which saw this great literary achievement, gave birth to some of the greatest masters of thought and composition in the most various departments of authorship. Shakespeare, Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon, and Hooker are its own; and they were, withal, more or less the panegyrists of Elizabeth and her religion, and moreover, at least the majority of them, adherents of her creed, because already clients of her throne. The Mother of the Reformation is, in the verses of Shakespeare, ‘a fair vestal throned by the west;’ in the poem of Spenser she is the Faery Queen, Gloriana, and the fair huntress Belphebe; while the militant Christian is rescued from the seductions of Popery, Duessa, by Una, the true Church, or Protestant religion. The works of these celebrated men have been but the beginning of a long series of creations of the highest order of literary merit, of which Protestantism is the intellectual basis, and Protestant institutions the informing object. What was wanting to lead the national mind a willing captive to the pretensions of Protestantism, beyond the fascination of genius so manifold and so various? What need of controversy to refute the claims of Catholicism? what need of closeness of reasoning, or research into facts, when under a queen’s smile this vast and continuous tradition had been unrolled before the eyes of men, illuminate with the most dazzling colours, and musical with the most subduing strains?”

The Protestant view, thus sustained by tradition, is destitute of every species of support from past or present facts. It rests on fable, invented, propagated, and believed by knavery, by folly, by credulity, by the shallowest ignorance. Of these fables the third lecture contains a few striking specimens, one of which refers to the building of the house for the Oratory at Birmingham. Father Newman thus exposes the marvellous violation of all common sense, and kind and gentlemanly feeling, into which Englishmen are led in their madness against the Church, and their voracity for charges against her:

“I feel ashamed, my brothers, of bringing my own matters before you, when far better persons have suffered worse imputa-

tions ; but bear with me. I, then, am the accused. A gentleman of blameless character, a county member, with whose near relatives I have been on terms of almost fraternal intimacy for a quarter of a century, who knows me by repute far more familiarly (I suppose) than any one in this room, putting aside my personal friends ; he it is who charges me, and others like me, with delighting in blood, with enjoying the shrieks and groans of agony and despair, with presiding at a banquet of dislocated limbs, quivering muscles, and wild countenances. Oh, what a world is this ! Could he look into our eyes and say it ? Would he have the heart to say it, if he recollected of whom he said it ? For who are we ? Have we lived in a corner ? Have we come to light suddenly out of the earth ? We have been nourished, for the greater part of our lives, in the bosom of the great schools and Universities of Protestant England ; we have been the foster-sons of the Edwards and Henries, the Wykehams and Wolseys, of whom Englishmen are wont to make much ; we have grown up amid hundreds of contemporaries, scattered at present all over the country, in those special ranks of society which are the very walk of a member of the legislature. Our names are better known to the educated classes of the country than those of any others who are not public men. Moreover, if there be men in the whole world who may be said to live *in publico*, it is the members of a college at one of our Universities ; living, not in private houses, not in families, but in one or two apartments which are open to all the world, at all hours, with nothing, I may say, their own ; with college servants, a common table,—nay, their chairs and their bedding, and their cups and saucers, down to their coal-scuttle and their carpet-brooms,—a sort of common property, and the right of their neighbours. Such is that manner of life, in which nothing, I may say, can be hid ; where no trait of character or peculiarity of conduct but comes to broad day,—such is the life I myself led for above a quarter of a century, under the eyes of numbers who are familiarly known to my accusers ; such is the life which we all have led ever since we have been in Birmingham, with our house open to all comers, and ourselves accessible.”

This point is carried out further in the following lecture, in which the failure of attempts to argue down Catholicism on real facts (even when, so far, they tell against us) is contrasted with the incredible success of the most unblushing falsehoods. Thus Blanco White's book against the Church, grounded on his knowledge of certain persons in Spain, produced little or no effect, and was suffered to become permanently out of print ; while Maria Monk's melodrama of horrors, the produce of her own diseased brain, which was rejected as a malicious fable by Protestants on the spot where she professed to have witnessed the crimes she narrates, has reached a circulation of nearly a quarter of a million copies.

Meanwhile, Protestantism is its own condemnation. Hu-

man nature and common sense burst through its pretended principles, and the Protestant world daily and systematically adopts those very practices which it condemns in Catholics, and is led by its own theories into enormities far exceeding those which it imputes to the laws and principles of Catholics. Image-worship, oath-breaking, persecution, and clerical celibacy, thus furnish Father Newman with striking illustrations of the logical inconsistency of the Protestant view.

How, then, is this perennial injustice and intellectual inconsistency possible in a being constituted as man is by nature, and in a state of society like that in which we now live? The phenomena of anti-Catholicism are so preposterous as to appear incredible, unless we can give some sort of metaphysical analysis of a moral and intellectual depravation so abnormal and degrading. What is the disease which thus warps the Protestant judgment, and turns a man of sense, candour, and honour into something nearly approaching idiocy or madness, when he comes in contact with Catholicism? That disease is *prejudice*. In the mind of our adversaries judgment is already given against us. If we are brought into court to undergo the mockery of a trial, it is only that we may afford sport to our persecutors. Whatever we urge, we are misunderstood; whatever we prove, our arguments are set aside as beneath examination; the mind of our assailants is nothing less than incapable of dealing fairly with us. What prejudice is, and how it differs from a mere act of the judgment, Father Newman lays down with great felicity.

For this passage, as well as for his wittily drawn picture of the prejudiced man's mode of arguing on the Catholic religion, we fear we have no space; but the following we cannot forbear extracting:

"One word here as to this growth of Catholicism, of conversions and converts;—the Prejudiced Man has his own view of it all. First, he denies the fact that there are any conversions or converts at all. This is a bold game, and will not succeed in England, though I have been told that in Ireland it has been strenuously maintained. However, let him grant the fact that converts there are, and he has a second ground to fall back upon: the converts are weak and foolish persons—notoriously so; all their friends think so; there is not a man of any strength of character or force of intellect among them. They have either been dreaming over their folios, or have been caught with the tinsel embellishment of Popish worship. They are lack-a-daisical women, or conceited young parsons, or silly squires, or the very dregs of our large towns, who have nothing to lose, and no means of knowing one thing from another. Thirdly, in corroboration: they went over, he says, on

such exceedingly wrong motives; not any one of them, but you may trace his conversion to something distinctly wrong; it was love of notoriety, it was restlessness, it was resentment, it was lightness of mind, it was self-will. There was trickery in his mode of taking the step, or inconsiderateness towards the feelings of others. They went too soon, or they ought to have gone sooner. They ought to have told every one their doubts as soon as ever they felt them, and before they knew whether or not they should overcome them or no. If they had clerical charges in the Protestant Church, they ought to have flung them up at once, even at the risk of afterwards finding they had made a commotion for nothing. Or, on the other hand, what, forsooth, must these men do, when a doubt came on their mind, but at once abandon all their clerical duty and go home, as if it were possible any where to be absolutely certain? In short, they did not become Catholics at the right moment; so that, however numerous they may be, no weight whatever attaches to their conversion. As for him, it does not affect him at all; he means to die just where he is; indeed these conversions are a positive argument in favour of Protestantism: he thinks still worse of Popery in consequence of these men going over than he did before. His fourth remark is of this sort: they are sure to come back. He prophesies that by this time next year not one of them will be a Catholic. His fifth is as bold as the first: they *have* come back. This argument, however, of the Prejudiced Man admits at times of being shewn to advantage, should it so happen that the subjects of his remark have, for some reason or other, gone abroad, for then there is nothing to restrain his imagination. Hence, directly a new Catholic is safely lodged two or three thousand miles away, out comes the confident news that he has returned to Protestantism, when no friend has the means to refute it. When this argument fails, as fail it must by the time a letter can be answered, our Prejudiced Man falls back on his sixth commonplace, which is to the effect that the converts are very unhappy. He knows this on the first authority; he has seen letters declaring or shewing it. They are quite altered men, very much disappointed with Catholicism, restless, and desirous to come back, except from false shame. Seventhly, they are altogether deteriorated in character; they have become harsh, or overbearing, or conceited, or vulgar. They speak with extreme bitterness against Protestantism, have cast off their late friends, or seem to forget that they ever were Protestants themselves. Eighthly, they have become infidels; alas, heedless of false witness, the Prejudiced Man spreads the news about right and left in a tone of great concern and distress; he considers it very awful.

“Lastly, when every resource has failed, and, in spite of all that can be said, and surmised, and expressed, and hoped, about the persons in question, Catholics they have become and Catholics they remain, the Prejudiced Man has a last resource; he simply forgets that Protestants they ever were. They cease to have antecedents; they cease to have any character, any history to which they may

appeal. They merge in the great fog in which, to his eyes, every thing Catholic is enveloped; they are dwellers in the land of romance and fable; and if he dimly contemplates them plunging and floundering amid the gloom, it is as griffins, wiverns, salamanders, the spawn of Popery, such as are said to sport in the depths of the sea, or to range amid the central sands of Africa. He forgets he ever heard of them; he has no duties to their names; he is released from all anxiety about them; he dies to them."

"Still," we may imagine a reasoning anti-Catholic to reply—"still there must be something more to bring out, before I see the whole process of the creation and nurture of this universal Protestant rancour. Surely Protestantism, at least in the case of the more educated ranks, must have *some* intellectual basis to rest upon. It is impossible but that your opponents, so innumerable, so respectable, so much given to reasoning in general, so capable of systematising their notions on other things, should be destitute of all ground for their intense feelings against you. Why, after all you have said in disproof of Protestant calumnies, does there remain a certain mysterious aptitude for accepting every fresh accusation against Catholicism? You tell us that the devil is the cause of it all; but that is not the question. Even granting a supernatural exciting power, I want to know *how* it acts upon us. Granting that it acts by means of this 'prejudice' in many instances, it certainly does not so in all; or at least prejudice is not the only source of hostility which it arouses against you. Explain this, then, if you can."

"I admit your statement," Father Newman substantially replies. "You have an intellectual basis, on which your more rational controversialists, whether consciously or unconsciously, rest their theories; while the same basis is more or less recognised by our most fanatical enemies. You have certain *assumed principles*, from which you start, and which you receive as geometrical axioms, as necessarily true, as needing no proof, and which are in direct contradiction to certain dogmas and practices of the Catholic faith." This point forms the subject of the seventh lecture, which we regard as one of the most able and the most important of the whole series; and we especially recommend it to careful attention, as furnishing a key to the whole mystery of anti-Catholic hostility, and as shewing the special point of attack upon which our controversial energies should be ever concentrated.

We can find room, however, but for one paragraph, which furnishes an instance of the lecturer's own way of illustrating the principle which he recognises, that *in a certain sense* ridicule is the test of truth. He has been putting in a

forcible way the arrogant narrow-mindedness with which popular Protestantism decides upon Catholicism, on its own unproved principles, ignoring history, and contradicting facts; and then he proceeds :

“What is all this but the very state of mind which we ridicule, and call narrowness, in the case of those who have never travelled? We call them, and rightly, men of contracted ideas, who cannot fancy things going on differently from what they have themselves witnessed at home, and laugh at every thing because it is strange. They themselves are the pattern men; their height, their dress, their manners, their food, their language, are all founded in the nature of things; and every thing else is good or bad, just in that very degree in which it partakes of them. All men ought to get up at half-past eight, breakfast between nine and ten, read the newspapers, lunch, take a ride or drive, dine. Here is the great principle of the day—dine; no one is a man who does not dine; yes, dine, and at the right hour; and it must *be* a dinner, with a certain time after dinner, and then in due time bed. Tea and toast, port wine, roast beef, mince-pies at Christmas, lamb at Easter, goose at Michaelmas, these are their great principles. They suspect any one who does otherwise. Figs and maccaroni for the day's fare, or Burgundy and grapes for breakfast!—they are aghast at the atrocity of the notion. And hence you read of some good country gentleman, who, on undertaking a Continental tour, was warned of the privations and mortifications that lay before him from the difference between foreign habits and his own, stretching his mind to a point of enlargement answerable to the occasion, and making reply, that he knew it, that he had dwelt upon the idea, that he had made up his mind to it, and thought himself prepared for any thing, provided he could but bargain for a clean tablecloth and a good rump-steak every day.”

Such is anti-Catholicism in its origin, its basis, its habits, and its principles. How, then, has it contrived to exist unchanged in an age when all thought has been revolutionised? By the most easily practised of devices. Simply by refusing to listen to the other side. With few exceptions, the Protestant world declines all intercourse with Catholics or their writings. The less they know of us, the more competent they conceive themselves to argue against us. Catholic doctrines and practices are so contemptibly silly and contrary to reason, that it is a mystery how any man of sense can accept them; and yet Catholics and Catholic books are so fascinating and plausible, that there is no safety for Protestantism, but by sending the former to Coventry, and by putting the latter on an *Index Expurgatorius*. The eighth of Father Newman's lectures thoroughly exposes this “protection of the Protestant view.”

The following extract happily illustrates and exposes the mode in which Protestants form their views of Catholicism :

“In Tetzels famous form at the beginning of the Reformation we read as follows : ‘shouldest thou not presently die, let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death.’ On this Dr. Waddington, ordinarily a cautious as well as candid writer, observes : ‘[it cannot] be disputed that it conferred an entire absolution, not only from all past, but also from all future sins. It is impossible with any shadow of *reason* to affix any other meaning to the concluding paragraph,’ which is the one I have quoted. Reason! how can reason help you here? could you have found out that ‘absolution’ meant ‘leave for communion’ by reason? Some things are determined by reason, others by sense, and others by testimony. We go to dictionaries for information of one kind, and to gazetteers for information of another. No one discovers the price of stocks, ministerial measures, or the fashions of the year, by reason. Whatever is spontaneous, accidental, variable, self-dependent, whatever is objective, we must go out of ourselves to determine. And such, for instance, is the force of language, such the use of formulas, such the value of theological terms. You learn pure English by reading classical authors and mixing in good society. Go, then, to those with whom such terms are familiar, who are masters of the science of them, and they will read the above sentence for you, not by reason, but by the usage of the Church; and they will read it thus : ‘If thou diest not now, but time hence, this indulgence will then avail thee, that is, in that case in which alone an indulgence ever can avail, *i. e.* *provided* that thou then art in a state of grace.’ There is no prospective pardon in the words so explained; an indulgence has nothing to do with pardon; it is an additional remission upon and after pardon, being the remission of the arrears of suffering due from those who are already pardoned. If on receipt of this indulgence, the recipient rushed into sin, the benefit of the indulgence would simply be suspended till he repented, went to confession, and gained a new spirit. If he was found in this state of pardon and grace at the point of death, then it would avail him at the point of death. Then that pardon, which his true repentance would gain him in the Sacrament of Penance, would be crowned by the further remission of punishment through the indulgence; not otherwise. If, however, a controversialist says that a common Catholic cannot possibly understand all this, that is a question of fact, not of reason; it does not stand to reason that he cannot; reason does not come in here. I do not say he *will* express himself with theological accuracy, but he knows perfectly well that an indulgence is no pardon for prospective sin, no standing pardon for a state of sin. If you think he does not, come and see. That is my key-note from first to last; come and see, instead of remaining afar off, and judging by reason.

“There are Protestant books explaining difficult passages of the Old Testament by means of present manners and customs among the Orientals,—a very sensible proceeding, and well deserving of

imitation by Protestants in the case before us ; let *our* obscure words and forms be interpreted by the understandings and habits of the Catholic people. On the other hand, in Dean Swift's well-known tale, you have an account of certain philosophers of Laputa who carried their head under their arm. These sagacious persons seldom made direct use of their senses, but acted by reason ; a tailor, for instance, who has to measure for a suit of clothes, I think, is described not as taking out his measures, but his instruments, quadrant, telescope, and the like. He measured a man as he would measure a mountain or a bog ; and he ascertained his build and his carriage as he might determine the right ascension of Syrius or the revolution of a comet. It was but a vulgar way to handle and turn about the living subject who was before him ; so our Laputan retreated, pulled out his theodolite instead of his slips of paper, and made an observation from a distance. It was a grand idea to make a coat by private judgment and a theodolite ; and, depend upon it, when it came home, it did not fit. Our Protestants wield the theodolite too ; they keep at a convenient distance from us, take the angles, calculate the sines and cosines, and work out an algebraic process, when common sense would bid them ask us a few questions. They observe latitude and longitude, the dip of the needle, the state of the atmosphere ; our path is an orbit, and our locus is expressed by an equation. They communicate with us by gestures, as you talk to the deaf and dumb ; and they are more proud of doing something, right or wrong, by a ceremony of this kind, than of having the learning of the Benedictines or the Bollandists, if they are to go to school for it."

After this, the lecturer draws his practical conclusion. It is briefly this: distrust all human supports, and give your whole strength and skill to the forcing upon the Protestant world a knowledge of your faith, your history, your practices, and yourselves.

"You are attacked," he says, "on many sides ; do not look about for friends on the right hand or on the left. Trust neither Assyria nor Egypt ; trust no body of men. Fall back on yourselves, and trust none but yourselves. I do not mean you must not be grateful to individuals who are generous to you, but beware of parties ; all parties are your enemies ; beware of alliances. You are your own best, and sure, and sufficient friends ; no one can really hurt you but yourselves, no one can succour you but yourselves. Be true to yourselves, and success is in your hands. Be content to have your conscience clear, and your God on your side. * *

"Protestantism is fierce, because it does not know you ; ignorance is its strength ; error is its life. Therefore bring yourselves before it, press yourselves upon it, force yourselves into notice against its will. Oblige men to know you ; persuade them, importune them, shame them into knowing you. Make it so clear what you are, that they cannot affect not to see you, nor refuse to justify you. Do not

even let them off with silence, but give them no escape from confessing that you are not what they have thought you were. They will look down, they will look aside, they will look in the air, they will shut their eyes, they will keep them shut. They will do all in their power not to see you; the nearer you come, will they close their eyelids all the tighter; they will be very angry and frightened, and give the alarm as if you were going to murder them. They will do any thing but look at you. They are, many of them, half conscious they have been wrong, but fear the consequences of learning it; they will think it best to let things alone, and to persist in injustice for good and all, since they are for so long a time committed to it; they will be too proud to confess themselves mistaken; they prefer a safe cruelty to an inconvenient candour. I know it is a most grave problem how to touch so intense an obstinacy, but observe if you once touch it, you have done your work. There is but one step between you and success."

And thus he addresses the Catholic laity. It is our last quotation; but of its importance we cannot speak too strongly.

" 'There is a time for silence, and a time to speak;' the time for speaking is come. What I desiderate in Catholics is, the gift of bringing out what they are, what their religion is; it is one of those 'better gifts' of which the Apostle bids you be 'zealous.' You must not hide your talent in a napkin, or your light under a bushel. I want a laity, not arrogant, not rash in speech, not disputatious, but men who know their religion, who enter into it, who know just where they stand, who know what they hold and what they do not, who know their creed so well that they can give an account of it, and who know enough of history to defend it. I want an intelligent, well-instructed laity; I am not denying you are such; but I mean to be severe, and, as some would say, exorbitant in my demands. I wish you to enlarge your knowledge, to cultivate your reason, to get an insight into the relation of truth to truth, to learn to view things as they are, to understand how faith and reason stand to each other, what are the bases and principles of Catholicism, and where lie the main inconsistencies and absurdities of the Protestant theory. I have no apprehension you will be worse Catholics for familiarity with these subjects, provided you cherish a vivid sense of God above, and that you have a soul to be judged and to be saved. In all times the laity have been the measure of Catholicism; they saved the Irish Church three centuries ago, and they betrayed it in England. Our rulers here were true, our people were cowards. You ought to be able to bring out what you feel and what you mean, as well as feel and mean it; to expose to the comprehension of others the fictions and fallacies of your opponents; and to explain the charges brought against us, to the satisfaction, not indeed of bigots, but of men of sense, of whatever cast of opinion. And one immediate effect of your being able to do all this, will be your gaining that proper confidence in self which is so necessary for you. You will

then not even have the temptation to rely on others, to court political parties or particular men; they will rather have to court you. You will no longer be dispirited or irritated (if such is at present the case) at finding difficulties in your way, in being called names, in not being believed, in being treated with injustice. You will fall back upon yourselves; you will be calm, you will be patient. Ignorance is the root of all littleness: he who can realise the laws of moral conflicts, and the incoherence of falsehood, and the issue of perplexities, and the end of all things, and the Presence of the Judge, becomes, from the very necessity of the case, philosophical, long-suffering, and magnanimous.

“Cultivation of mind, I know well, is not the same thing as religious principle, but it contributes much to remove from our path the temptation to many lesser forms of moral obliquity. Human nature, left to itself, is susceptible of innumerable feelings, more or less unbecoming, indecorous, petty, and miserable. It is, in no long time, clad and covered by a host of little vices and disgraceful infirmities, —jealousies, slynesses, cowardices, frettings, resentments, obstinacies, crookedness in viewing things, vulgar conceit, impertinence, and selfishness. Mental cultivation, though it does not of itself touch the greater wounds of human nature, does a good deal for these lesser defects. In proportion as our intellectual horizon recedes, and we mount up in the knowledge of men and things, so do we make progress in those qualities and that character of mind which we denote by the word ‘gentleman;’ and if this applies in its measure to the case of all men, whatever the religious principles, much more is it true of a Catholic. Your opponents, my brothers, are too often emphatically *not* gentlemen: but it will be for you, in spite of whatever provocations you may meet with, to be manly and noble in your bearing towards them; to be straightforward in your dealings with them; to shew candour, generosity, honourable feeling, good sense, and forbearance, in spite of provocation; to refrain from taking unfair or small advantages over them; to meet them half-way, if they shew relentings; not to fret at insults, to bear imputations, and to interpret the actions of all in the best sense you possibly can. It is not only more religious, not only more becoming, not only happier, to have these excellent dispositions of mind, but it is far the most likely way, in the long-run, of persuasion and success.”

If, however, there are any of our Catholic readers who may be disposed to doubt the prudence of the system thus recommended, we earnestly beg their attention to the following reflections, with which we shall conclude. There are prevalent amongst us, Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, two views as to the mode in which it is most politic to present the Catholic faith to our unbelieving fellow-countrymen. We are not, of course, in the slightest degree impugning the motives of those who adopt that one of these two views which we ourselves conceive to be erroneous; we are merely stating

the fact, that while some amongst us would set the faith before the world in its open, undisguised, actually existing reality, as it is embodied in the worship, the books, the practices, and the ideas of the most thoroughly Catholic portions of the great Catholic family; others would pare down our creed to the lowest proportions which faith will tolerate, and adapt it (as they imagine) to the national peculiarities of Englishmen, and the prejudices of Protestants. What is fit for Italy and Belgium, say the disciples of the latter school, is not fit for England. Devotions, books, saints' lives, popular practices, church services and decorations, miraculous histories, and various other such matters, which are well enough in a Catholic country, ought not to be put forward before a people steeped, like the English, in the depths of heresy, unbelief, and prejudice. Do not put forth legendary tales, do not speak of miraculous relics, do not say a word about St. Januarius and the Madonna of Rimini, do not put up too many images in your churches, do not let the people decorate them with trumpery, do not say too much about the "glories of Mary" and the "power of Mary," do not make much of such devotions as the Sacred Heart of Jesus, do not let your monks go about without shoes and stockings, do not popularise your services, do not profess your loyalty to the Pope so loudly, hush up such historical facts as the existence of an Inquisition in Rome, talk a great deal about the Bible and circulate it, and say nothing of the few copies of the Scriptures which are to be found among the poor in Catholic countries; in short, make Catholicism as *respectable* and as little *supernatural* as possible, in order to commend it to the *common sense* of the more "liberal" portion of the English nation.

Can, then, this latter theory be upheld consistently with the great truth expounded and enforced in the seventh of the lectures before us? We think, ourselves, that they are utterly irreconcilable, and that the attempt to confer an apparent Protestantism on Catholicism is as philosophically erroneous as it is unwarranted by actual facts. The hostility of Protestants lies far deeper than in a local or personal distaste for certain ceremonies or devotions, or a disinclination for the miraculous and supernatural when not rigidly established by proofs. The conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism is one of *first principles*; and until those principles are brought face to face, no real progress is made towards an understanding between the parties. Contests about this or that detail in Catholic customs, this or that miraculous story, this or that misinterpretation of a Scripture text, are mere beatings about the bush. The real question between us is not even touched. Strip our re-

ligion of all its so-called extravagances, bad taste, and superstitions, and the innate hostility of our enemies remains precisely what it was at the beginning ; for this reason, that it is *not* directed against the non-essentials of Catholic opinion and practice, but against the elementary doctrines of the Catholic faith itself. Protestant hostility is, in truth, nothing more than the hostility of the natural heart of man to the revelation which Almighty God has made concerning Himself and his will. The natural mind is the enemy of God ; it rebels against his authority ; it dreads his approach ; it shrinks instinctively from any doctrine which declares his immediate presence ; it abhors any practice which forces on itself a consciousness of the damnable nature of sin, and of its own sins in particular ; in a word, it hates the Catholic faith, because that faith introduces Almighty God himself into his own world, treads under foot human pride, and claims an absolute obedience of body, soul, and spirit to the divine will. The assumed principles of Protestantism are nothing more than a set of axioms directly in contradiction with the elements of all revelation and pure morality. They are the whispers of Satan, accepted and appropriated by the human mind as its reasons for setting God at defiance. And until those principles are dethroned from their supremacy, not one single step is made towards the conversion of a soul. The disease is not touched ; it is the symptoms alone which for a brief time may be palliated.

There is scarcely a Catholic doctrine or practice which does not thus conflict with the natural godlessness and haughtiness of man. The Real Presence is painful, because man shrinks from the immediate presence of God ; confession is intolerable, because it enforces a practical self-knowledge and a recognition of the hatefulness of sin ; images and the invocation of Saints are odious, because they compel us to feel that we are living in the midst of an invisible world ; the magnificence of Catholic worship is distasteful, as conveying a reproach to those who spend their wealth on earthly gratifications ; the virtues of relics, and all miraculous events in general, are a fearful testimony to the almighty power of God, of his nearness to us, and of the littleness of human power ; the doctrine of infallibility crushes intellectual pride ; the celibacy of the clergy is a protest against the easy, comfortable notions of religion and its ministrations, with which the world attempts to serve God and mammon together ; monasteries and convents austere proclaim the nothingness of every thing in this life ; purgatory strikes at the fond wish of the sinner to believe that his sins are forgotten by God as soon as they are forgotten by himself ; the minute details of Catholic ceremo-

nial are disagreeable to a world which cannot bear too much fuss about religion, and loves "simplicity" in serving God, and in nothing else; the value of tradition is denied, because it makes labour and study obligatory upon those who would dogmatise or teach; the Papal supremacy is an abomination, because it interferes with the rule of national pride, and proclaims the power of God to set up an empire among men, without having regard to human conquests or human laws.

The revelation of Jesus Christ, then, being thus in direct antagonism with unconverted human nature, the real process of conversion begins when the doctrines of revelation are brought into direct contact with these antagonist principles, which are the true causes of the rejection of Catholicism. The intellectual proofs of the Catholic religion are abundantly cogent, when the mind is so affected by divine grace as to have lost (even in a slight degree) its original moral antipathies to the doctrines it proclaims. And it is when these doctrines are thus *applied* to the conscience, that the test commences its operation. If the grace of God awakens the requisite moral sensibilities, the work of conversion progresses; if the devil retains his hardening power, all the proofs on earth and in heaven will never make a sincere convert.

And if this be the case, are we not warranted in considering that the most prudent way of setting to work to convert our fellow-countrymen is to direct all our forces against the citadel of their fortress? What do we gain by actually concealing the most anti-Protestant of our doctrines? Nothing. What advance have we made, when we have deprived ourselves of any spiritual advantages, in order that we may not shock the fastidiousness of our Protestant neighbours? None whatever. There is one thing which in their natural hearts they abhor, and which is the secret source of their opposition: the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and all its consequences as declared and embodied in Catholic dogma, Catholic rites, and Catholic morals. If we are prepared to banish *Christ crucified* from our creed, "liberal" Protestants will be really *conciliated*; but not till then.

ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH RATIONALISTS.

Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme. Par M.
l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens.

THE treatise whose title we have prefixed has appeared in a series of articles in the *Université Catholique*, one of the ablest French theological reviews, and proceeds from a pen deservedly celebrated in the Catholic world. The title sets forth the object of these papers, namely, to demonstrate the necessary connexion subsisting between Rationalism and Communism. This whole question is undoubtedly in a state of much greater development among our neighbours on the other side the water than among ourselves. The logical connexion between ideas and morality, principles and practice, has been distinctly perceived, and fearlessly worked out and accepted, by the clear, rapid, and systematising French mind. Our own countrymen are much slower at this sort of work. They are by no means so impatient to apply a principle, or to deduce consequences from the ideas afloat in their minds, unless some immediate (as they would call it) practical result is clearly to be attained. They care little for what bears the appearance of a merely metaphysical or abstract connexion between certain ideas; things with them must be fitted for present use, or they are put by as subjects only suited to supply matter of speculation to philosophers, or amusement to men of literary leisure. An ordinary Englishman is therefore not at all anxious to classify, or arrange, or understand, the bearing of his general ideas and principles. They may be held by him in the most peaceful confusion, and the most antagonistic opposition to each other, and it distresses him not; nay, he does not even perceive it.

This, we apprehend, is far less the case with the ordinary Frenchman; and we take the class of ordinary men as an exemplification of our assertion, because they best exhibit the tendencies of the national mind. We imagine, then, that if you take on chance an Englishman and a Frenchman from that numerous class of persons from whom no danger is to be apprehended of a conflagration either in the Thames or in the Seine, you will find this marked difference between them. The Frenchman will have a certain definite system of ideas. He will have his little notions of philosophy, of taste, of criticism, of moral and social order, &c.; and he will not be satisfied unless these form, as he conceives, a compact and well-connected system of ideas, mutually harmonising and hanging

together. Of course, all this may be extremely shallow, and the connexion he perceives very superficial and one-sided, and his reasoning may be full of fallacies; this is another question: but what we mean is, that he will not feel contented without imagining that he possesses a consistent body of opinions, and can give an account of them satisfactory at least to himself. The commonplace Englishman, on the other hand, is no way solicitous to possess any lucid order among his ideas, save within the province of his own business or pursuit in life. The rigorous application of his intellectual powers to deduce consequences, or hunt back for principles, in order to arrive at the root of what he holds, begins and ends there. A great part of his mind is to him a *terra incognita*, or rather a sort of chaos. The consequence is, that many evil as well as good principles are held by him in a latent state; whereas it is quite otherwise with the Frenchman, whose theories, as we know, far from remaining thus dormant, are continually exploding, or threatening to explode, in some startling practical result.

There is evil as well as good resulting from both these peculiar national tendencies of mind. Perhaps it is owing to this strong habitual tendency to connect ideas, that medium goodness or badness is less abundant in France than England. There is less of that average moral and religious *respectability*, which neither aspires very high nor sinks very low; there is more of strong light and shade, and less of grey twilight. There is a certain heroism of goodness, or fanaticism of evil. There is exalted faith, or declared and unblushing infidelity. Anglican Protestantism could never have taken root and flourished in France. Our neighbours, speaking in a general way, will ever be Catholics or total unbelievers. If, on the other hand, *our* evil principles often remain comparatively harmless and infructuous, so unfortunately also do our good ones; and the alarm which the former ought to create, both in the mind that entertains them and in society at large, is set to sleep, and we go on congratulating ourselves upon the possession of a degree of moral eminence to which we have no solid claim. Besides, evil principles do not remain for ever dozing like the benumbed snake. Englishmen can think, and think deeply, and to some purpose, when once roused to reflection; and we see around us ominous symptoms of this awakening to active energy of principles, whose fearful application minds have hitherto either not perceived or timidly evaded. The press affords ample and alarming proof of the progress which an unmasked Rationalism is making among the thinking classes, —for Rationalism, however it may be disguised, already exists

wherever Protestantism exists; and any one at all acquainted with the state of mind of the poorer orders, must know how extensively the principles of Socialism are gaining ground among them.

The subject of the Abbé Gerbet's able papers is, therefore, by no means one of merely foreign interest, or one of which it may seem premature to treat; on the contrary, it has a peculiar interest as applied to ourselves, because, if there be any truth in the foregoing remarks, the order of minds to which the Abbé's argument is addressed is necessarily exceedingly numerous in this country. We will give his own words. He begins by clearly defining the terms *Rationalism* and *Communism*, and stating what they aim at:

"We have beheld," he says, "during these last three centuries, developing itself in different degrees among all civilised nations, a principle to which the name of *Rationalism* has been given. According to this principle, each man can reasonably admit as truths those things alone of which he acquires the proof directly, by means of his own conceptions. In our day we have seen the beginning of the evolution of another principle, according to which each man can retain as his lawful possession those things alone the enjoyment of which he obtains through his own labour. This principle is the foundation of what is called *Communism*."

"Rationalism may be summed up in this formula: it proclaims the sovereignty of the individual in the *intellectual* order; pretending to emancipate his intellect from the rules and restraints imposed upon him by religious society, which is founded upon traditional dogmatical teaching. The general formula of Communism is the sovereignty of the individual in the *material* order; it pretends to emancipate his physical energies from the rules and restraints imposed upon him by domestic and political society, which is founded on the hereditary transmission of goods. The first speaks in the name of reason, the second in that of justice."

"But both the one and the other proclaim, under different relations, the sovereignty of the individual, with a view to establish the same result, each in its own order, viz. community. According to Rationalism, the destruction of all belief received upon authority will entail community of intellectual goods, and participation in all the sources of truth. According to Communism, the destruction of all property acquired by inheritance will produce community of material goods. The one promises, as the result of community, an indefinite progress of knowledge; the other an unlimited increase of enjoyment."

"Modern society" (the Abbé continues) "divides itself, as respects these two doctrines, into three classes. The first is neither Rationalist nor Communist; it is composed, speaking generally, of all those who have Christian faith, in the proper sense of the word. These constitute the mass of the defenders of those maxims which

are conservative of property. They profess to believe that if Christianity promulgates, together with the fundamental law of fraternal charity, the principle of union amongst men, it recognises also another law which consecrates, under the name of property, the division of goods.

"The second class is both Communist and Rationalist. The leaders, the writers, and the agents of Communism are generally to be met with in the ranks of that philosophy which is hostile to faith. They call themselves the continuators of the philosophical movement of modern times, the true inheritors of the lights which it disseminated. I have considerable doubts whether many among them could give a very clear account of this relationship, or whether they have examined to any depth the questions belonging to it. But although they may not perceive with any distinctness the connexion between Rationalism and Communism, they believe at least that they are sensible of their affinity.

"The third class occupies a middle position. In religious matters it is Rationalist; in matters which concern property it is Conservative. It thinks that Rationalism and Communism, although they appear to be parallel doctrines in certain respects, are nevertheless radically distinct. Not only does this class hold to the first as obstinately as it rejects the second, but it believes, at least it hopes, that Rationalism, being the normal state of the human intellect, and consequently enabling it to put forth its strongest powers, can alone in the long-run achieve an effectual triumph over social errors. Nevertheless, it is of opinion that the belief in Christian truths, which rules a large portion of the population, is, as a matter of fact, most useful, and even necessary, in order to prevent the spread, and counteract the influence, of those systems which alarm it: this, however, it considers but a relative and temporary need. It is convinced that if the lights which it possesses, and which are in themselves sufficient, come to be gradually diffused, and in a due proportion, among the inferior classes, the whole of society will become so eminently intellectual, that it will be well able to take care of itself by the sole power of reason, without the help of faith."

Now this class we believe to be not only extremely numerous, but at the present time the most influential, and the dominant one in this country. A glance at the spirit in which the counsels of the nation are guided, and in which our rulers undertake every measure of supposed improvement, will suffice to convince us of this. Rationalist in the order of ideas, conservative where property is at stake; valuing religion, not as teaching the knowledge and the love of God, but simply for what it can effect in the moral and social order of things; idolising the idea of the progress of the human race, that is, the progress of the intellectual animal man in scrutinising the laws of nature, that he may wield her vast powers so as to minister to the indulgence of his senses and the grati-

fication of his intellect; dead to the spiritual end for which man was created, and which all else should but subserve; abhorring, therefore, the very idea—the very name—of spiritual power, and striving ever to make it the mere servant of the temporal, yet at the same time casting a glance of fear at the mass of Socialism fermenting all around them, a fear quieted only by an occasional *act of faith* in England's supposed charter of immunity from the evils which fall on other nations; as anxious to preserve the sacred and traditionary principles which guard the rights of property, as they are to pull down all notion of a purely spiritual authority, the guardian of the truths of faith;—such are our modern statesmen, and such are the principles on which the government of this country is conducted; a government which, as is well known, is itself ruled by the spirit of the influential and dominant class; and such principles, we venture to say, are entertained, with more or less of distinctness, by a vast body of those who possess property in these realms. It will be objected, perhaps, that *as a body* this class are far from professing or avowing infidel opinions; that, on the contrary, they desire, speaking in a general way, to uphold religion in some form or another; and that though of course avowed infidels are to be met with, and, it must be confessed, assume every day a bolder tone, yet that there exists not in this country a class who, *as a class*, can be collectively described as the one which the Abbé Gerbet characterises as devoid altogether of religious belief.

Waving the question as to the spread of open infidelity among us, which, however, we should be disposed to consider as much greater than is imagined by the generality, we have an answer to make altogether independent of this consideration. We have already remarked that Protestantism is based upon the principle of Rationalism; but Protestantism must be viewed under two aspects; as it is in the abstract, and as it is in the concrete. In the abstract, it lays down the principle of private judgment, which is, of course, utterly at variance with the Catholic doctrine of authority and traditionary teaching. In the concrete, as Protestantism does not avow its identity with unbelief, it has to put forth a religion, and so to become *constructive* instead of *destructive*; that is, it is forced so far into a position of direct contradiction to its own principles: it begins to teach, and therefore, if it would claim any right to be heard, to teach upon the plea of some species of authority. Hence a contradiction in the minds of Protestants themselves: they hold the principle of infidelity, though often, by a happy inconsistency, with more or less of belief on the surface of

their minds, or, as we would hope, still cherished in their hearts. The proper development, however, of Protestantism is unbelief; and we do not see why the Abbé's remarks are not as applicable to latent as to avowed infidelity. His object is to shew that the conservative Rationalists of France are inconsistent in rejecting the moral and social consequences of the opinions which they hold, with a thorough consistency, in spiritual and intellectual things. The argument, surely, has not less force as directed against the corresponding class in this country, merely because many, or, as we may hope, the majority of them, have not as yet thoroughly carried out their principle even in the domain of spiritual truth. This is but one inconsistency the more. Besides, there is one striking resemblance between them, which we have already noticed, in the light in which they regard religious truths, that is, not for what they *are*, but for what they can *do*. This is to reject the Catholic principle of an authority teaching a body of objective doctrine, which claims the homage of our faith and obedience, simply on the ground of its being the truth of God, as completely as any infidel rejects it. We shall, therefore, make no further apology for considering the Abbé's argument as equally cogent when addressed to the Rationalists, *i. e.* the Protestants, of England, as when urged against the avowed unbelievers of France.

The importance of the subject cannot be overrated.

"I have the deepest conviction," says M. Gerbet, "that Rationalism and Communism form essentially one and the same principle acting in two different spheres, and that the second does but realise, in the order of material enjoyments, what the first has propagated in the superior intellectual region. If this be so, this class (that of conservative Rationalists, whom he is addressing), so powerful from their numbers, intellectual culture, general activity, and social position, lie under an immense responsibility."

We believe that the same may be said with perfect truth of that influential class in our country who are so unhappily and unknowingly playing into the hands of Communism; and any thing which may serve to direct attention to this fact cannot be urged too strongly on them.

One word more before we proceed to give a slight sketch of the Abbé's line of argument. An objection may be taken to it which our author has foreseen, though he does not notice it until his concluding chapter. This objection is not new to ourselves, as we have often heard it advanced against the arguments employed by Catholics when reasoning with those who are external to the Church.

The force of the objection consists in this, that such a line

of reasoning is destructive, not constructive, forcing men, on pain of appearing inconsistent, to adopt further consequences which they had hitherto not apprehended. We cannot reply better than in our author's own words.

"If this reproach were just, I should have for my accomplices all the defenders of religion. They have always chosen a course analogous to that which I have myself pursued. When in the seventeenth century the great Catholic controversialists, with Bossuet at their head, strove to prove to the Lutherans and Calvinists that Protestantism logically leads to the destruction of Christian faith and to indifference in religious matters, men might have said to them also, as in truth they did, 'You maintain a fatal thesis. You push men who admit certain Christian dogmas to throw off Christianity altogether, if they would not be taxed with inconsistency. Is it not better that men should be Protestants than Deists?' This objection did not silence the defenders of the Church. They replied, that to avoid inconsistency the Protestant Christian was not forced to become a deist; he had only to return to being a Catholic."

The Abbé applies the same argument to the case of deists, atheists, and materialists, upon whom Protestants themselves are in the habit of urging the fatal consequences which their principles involve. He then continues :

"The fact is, that the defence of truth against any system of error whatsoever necessarily implies a mode of procedure similar to that with which we are reproached. Error is combated, not only by disputing its principles, but also by exposing its consequences."

We would add, that even where principles are disputed, the process is still fundamentally the same; and whether the question be put in a constructive or destructive shape, its real purport is not altered. You ask a man either, why holding so much, he does not hold more, or why rejecting so much, he still holds what he does hold. If he really *believes* in earnest what he has retained, it is impossible he should embrace the destructive alternative. Any how, the danger is one which cannot be avoided, if we would attempt to win men from error. We fully coincide with another remark of our author's :

"It is much more important," he observes, "that a Rationalist should become a Catholic, than it is matter of regret that a Conservative should become a Communist. The adversary of property subverts, at least directly, only the material basis of *human* society; while the adversary of the faith directly assails the very basis of that society which binds men to God, and consequently the mutual relations of men with each other."

There is no great danger in England of our conservative Rationalists being driven, by the love of consistency, to em-

brace Communism. They are, as a class, either well-to-do, as it is called, in the world, or at any rate have something to lose, which they are little disposed to sacrifice for a theoretical consistency, about which, as we have shewn, men are not greatly solicitous in this country. There is much more danger of their embracing the ultimate consequences of the doctrine of private judgment in the spiritual order, rather than give up this their beloved opinion. It is, therefore, well to shew them that the train of consequences cannot stop there; and though they may be prepared to sacrifice their God to a logical necessity, they will pause perhaps when they apprehend that the next demand will be upon their purses and estates.

While we maintain, however, that truth, when set before men, must, like its Divine Source, He who is Himself the very Truth, often become a stumbling-block to men, instead of the rock of their salvation, we are free to confess that it is not always discreet to advance the arguments in favour of it in what may be called their destructive form. Where error is the fruit of an almost inculpable ignorance, we think men should rather be called upon to believe more on the strength of what they already accept, than asked why they believe so much. Such persons, in fact, need illumination and patient instruction rather than startling argument. They have to be led on rather than contended with. But where error has the actively heretical element about it, it is vain to hope to deal with it in this way. A man who has imbibed the spirit of heresy does not *love* truth sufficiently to follow where it leads. What he loves is his own opinion and himself; and it is only by holding up before his eyes the hideous consequences of the principles he has adopted, that it can be hoped to make much impression upon him.

In reviewing this work, we must necessarily pass over without notice much that would interest our readers. We can give only a general idea of the author's argument, and that with a view principally of pointing out the coincidence in spirit of the less developed Rationalism of Protestant England with that which finds a more definite expression among the freethinkers of France. If they be radically identical, there is the same danger in the social order to be apprehended from the sway of such principles among ourselves as on the other side the Channel. Men, it is true, may flatter themselves that the application of these principles by the lower orders is but a remote contingency, seeing that even the educated classes are so insensible as yet to their full scope and bearing; but this would be greatly to delude ourselves, and to shut our eyes to

the ordinary course of things. The pressure of social disadvantages, which morally degrades them and leaves them destitute of all religious belief, arouses the passions of men, and naturally impels them to regard with enmity that society which, instead of fostering them in its bosom, seems to cast them forth as aliens, and to lie like an incubus upon them. Men, under these circumstances, do not await the clear development of those principles which serve to justify their hostility, though they greedily seize at the first glance on doctrines which seem to transform an envious and sullen discontent into a just and laudable indignation. These feelings of animosity, as a matter of fact, are alive and potently working in the breasts of thousands, though at present kept down by the strong arm of power; and, what is worse, they are on the increase. They grow as our mass of pauperism and heathenism grows; and by and by (nor does the time appear far removed) the conservative classes will have a hard battle to fight to maintain their ground. What, then, is to be done? Protestant and respectable England would fain argue with this mass, and indoctrinate it with better and safer notions, if not for the love of God, for the love of self; it would tame the monster if it could, ere it attain its mature and terrible strength. But it is powerless to effect what it would desire. Can we suppose that the practical Communist will not keenly perceive the weak points in such arguments as Protestants can bring to bear upon him? Nay, does he not already perceive them? Are not men always most sharp-sighted in discovering pleas to justify their evil desires, and do they not instinctively grasp at whatever holds out this promise? Demagogues, too, are never wanting to translate into popular language, and push to their extreme consequences, those theories which lend their sanction to the passions of the multitude; and who can estimate the tremendous power which these passions acquire when those who are actuated by them have persuaded themselves, or have been persuaded by others, that they can take their stand upon some principle of justice and common sense, and when, strong in this persuasion, they can also point to the weakness, hollowness, and inconsistency of the arguments employed by their adversaries? We must postpone, however, the remarks we have to make till our next Number.

THE PARSON FLY-FISHING.

The Erne, its Legends and its Fly-Fishing. By the Rev. Henry Newland, Rector and Vicar of Westbourne. Chapman and Hall.

THE Rev. Henry Newland is a liberal-minded (not a "liberal") parson, of a school not now so common as in days gone by. He shews that he is of no very modern school by calling himself a *parson*; a term which, though used in a technical sense by Catholics when they would distinguish a minister of the Establishment both from a Catholic priest and a Dissenting preacher, has grown somewhat odious in the various Protestant clerical circles of the day. For the rest, Mr. Newland is an Englishman of gentlemanly feelings, kind heart, and good sense; with a keen relish for sport, at least of the piscatory kind; a staunch love for his own Communion, united with a degree of candour and respect for Catholics and their practices, which is rare enough in a clerical Tory, unless when, under the dominion of Puseyism, he has a passion for patronising a "sister Church," aping her ceremonials, and adopting her language.

Mr. Newland has written his book for the purpose of exalting the merits of the Erne and its fly-fishing, and of recording his reminiscences of many pleasant hours passed on its banks. This he does by introducing four interlocutors, the Captain, the Parson, the Squire, and the Scholar; and the volume professes to narrate their sayings and doings during a season of sport on the Erne and its neighbouring lakes. The *facts*, he tells us in his dedicatory epistle, are true, but the characters are but the representatives of the three or four squires, the five or six captains, the dozen or so of parsons, and the innumerable multitude of scholars, whom he has met and consorted with in one or other of his pleasant summer campaigns, in company with his friend, Sir Charles Taylor. With the mysteries of fishing, the rising of trout, the weight of salmon, the manufacture of flies, he mingles a sufficiency of legends and scenes of Irish character; so that the whole is a very agreeable book of light, gossipy reading of its kind. The parson's Protestantism now and then peeps out, but it is in so good-humoured a way, and with so little real irreverence, that we cannot help wishing that of the 15,000 incumbents and curates of the Anglican Establishment none were more irreligious or more prejudiced than the "Rector and Vicar of Westbourne."

It is somewhat astonishing, even in these days of Imitative-Catholicism, to hear a genuine "parson" offering something very like an apology for the pilgrimages of Lough Derg.

Our author, though a Protestant to the core, is no friend to the Irish Orangemen; witness his clever picture of the worship of "Saint William of Orange." It is agreeable also to find a Protestant not ashamed to fulfil in his own case the prophecy of her who foretold that all generations should call her *blessed*.

" 'Come, my worthy young friend,' said the Squire, as the Captain finished his story, and the Scholar looked at him with a ludicrous expression of disbelieving wonderment, 'I think it is high time to turn in now; the Parson has been yawning this half-hour. Come along; never mind the fairies, and don't go dreaming of gaugers and clubs.' 'And do not be afraid of an Irish Vehmgericht,' said the Captain; 'at least not here: the Parson has been humbugging you; for Mother Johnson, besides being the civillest woman and the best cook in the three baronies, 'the best wife, the best Christian, and the best maker of cold rum-punch,' (only she makes it hot, and with whisky,) is, into the bargain, as thorough-going a Protestant as ever drowned a lily.' 'Drowned a lily?' said the Squire, interrogatively. 'Ay, drowned a lily,' said the Parson, quietly; 'a religious ceremony in these parts.' 'What the devil!' said the Squire; 'this is the first I have heard of it.' The Parson loved to get a rise out of his Orange and Protestant friend; so drawing himself up in his chair, in the attitude of a professor delivering a lecture, he began didactically:— 'The country of Ireland is divided into two religions: that of the higher classes is Anythingarianism; that of the lower, pure Popery. For further particulars on this subject see Swift, from whom I quote this passage. The principal difference between these two sects is, that the latter worship a multiplicity of Saints (being only too glad of any pretext whatever for keeping holiday and being idle); while the former, like the Mahometans, worship one only. This saint is William, king and confessor. St. William was duly canonised by Act of Parliament, and in England has had half the 5th of November dedicated to him, but in Ireland the whole of the 12th of July. On this latter day his worshippers walk in solemn procession to the church, where the pulpit (which is the Anythingarian high-altar) is profusely decorated with lilies, the flower sacred to the saint in question. This flower is not white, like that dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, indicating her purity, but of a strong brimstone colour; what that indicates, I do not know; it is, however, always regarded with high esteem and veneration. These lilies, duly consecrated by the sermon, which generally is a pretty strong one, are distributed to the worshippers, who immediately proceed to drown them. This part of the ceremony is, I believe, seldom or never performed in church. The bell of the flower is stripped from its stem, and is placed, stalk up-permost, in an empty tumbler, where it is immediately surrounded

with lumps of white sugar. It is then drowned, or covered with whisky, the national spirit, which, when the bells are large, generally fills about three-fourths of the tumbler; water is poured upon the top of this, particular care being taken by the celebrants that it be screeching hot. The whole then is solemnly drained to the very bottom, the leader first pronouncing a set form of words, which, like most religious mysteries, is totally unintelligible to the uninitiated. I cannot give you much information about the remaining part of the ceremonies, which, like those of Eleusis, are carried on throughout the whole of the night; but the next morning the *mystæ* are commonly found in as exhausted a state as ever was Pythoness of old. They are then generally carried to bed; and, indeed, are frequently some days before they entirely recover their senses.' The wrath of the Scholar had been gradually rising throughout the whole of this lecture, which the Parson delivered with the most absurd gravity; and there is no saying what might have been the upshot, had not the Squire good-humouredly pushed him down the stairs before him; while the Captain, who had just drawn back the curtain that concealed a far cleaner bed than the rest of the establishment would lead one to expect, shouted after him, 'Good night, Scholar! sleep in peace. Keep a civil tongue in your head about Rome, and may St. William have you in his holy keeping!'"

"The author has been furnished with a copy of the Commemoration-service of the great Anythingarian saint, by a correspondent from the north of Ireland. It would be altogether foreign to the tolerant spirit which so happily characterises the nineteenth century, were he to seem to condemn the religious observances of any denomination of Christians; moreover, he is not quite certain that he entirely understands one word of it. Nevertheless, he thinks it advisable to suppress certain parts, which a harshly-judging public might think blasphemous or indecent. The remainder is as follows:—'The glorious, pious, and immortal memory of the great and good King William, who delivered us from Popery, slavery, brass money, wooden shoes, and warming-pans. May he who refuses to drink this be rammed, and damned, and double-damned, and crammed into the great gun of Athlone, and fired up into the elements, and blown to smithereens, to make sparrow-bills for Orangemen's shoes! May his soul be in the Pope's belly, the Pope in the devil's belly, the devil in hell, hell in flames, and the key in the Orangeman's pocket . . . and a fig for the Bishop of Cork.'"

Inglis's book on Ireland is now pretty well forgotten, but our author has reminded his readers of its existence, not very much in a way to restore it to the animation of an extensive circulation. We suspect that for not a few of the marvellous stories which Protestants contrive to digest respecting Ireland and Catholicism Paddy himself is answerable, from his love of bothering the heretics.

" 'How on earth,' said the Captain one day to the Parson, 'do

you pick up all these stories? People never tell them to me.' 'Because you laugh at them,' said the Parson. 'An Irishman is very sensitive to ridicule. Perhaps he has a secret consciousness that some of these stories of his require a little faith in the hearer, and he will not subject his cherished belief to the test of an unfriendly one. One thing is quite certain, if you ask an Irishman a direct question about any thing, you will not get a direct answer. Did I never tell you about Inglis and his book?' 'No,' said the Captain. 'I have read his book, and a nice, pleasant, lively, well-written book it is; but singularly inaccurate, whenever you come to detail.' 'And well it may be,' said the Parson; 'and I will tell you how it happens that it is so. In the course of his travels Master Inglis comes to Ballyshannon, and asks for an intelligent guide to shew him the country. You will agree with me that he could hardly have found a more intelligent fellow than the man he got; our friend Pat Gallagher, no less. I was talking to Pat about it the other day. 'He got out a big pocket-book,' said Pat, 'and he cut his pencil, and he sat down on a rock-stone, and asked me about the priests, and the rents, and the crops, and the landlords, and what-and-all besides. I never saw such a divel for asking.' 'And what did you tell him, Pat?' said I. 'O, the divel a word of truth did he get from me, your riverence.' 'Why, you don't mean to say that you let him put down a parcel of stuff that was not true!' 'Troth, an' he did, then, your riverence.' 'And why on earth could you not tell him the truth?' said I. 'Ah! Who would be the fool, then?—how would I know what he'd be after?' 'But what *did* you tell him?' said I, laughing; for I was mightily tickled at the idea of Inglis's describing from personal observation, as he calls it, the manners and customs of the Irish. 'Why, then,' said Pat, 'I disremember me just the particular lie that I told; it was just the first that came into my head.' 'Well,' said the Captain, laughing, 'at all events Paddy ought not to complain of being misrepresented by the Sassenagh, if that is the way he misrepresents himself. Poor Inglis evidently did his very best to get genuine information; it is not his fault that he did not get it.' 'Yes, but no bookmaker can take the right way to get it,' said the Parson; 'he cannot find time. You are not going to pick up accurate information by galloping along a turnpike-road, and asking questions right and left of you. With respect to Inglis though, I am afraid a graver charge lies against him. He started on his travels with a strong Whig bias, and put leading questions; and you know that you may get any Irishman to tell any lie you please out of mere civility. He is just the boy for a leading question. The Squire once made a bet with me that he would, within ten minutes, make the same man say that the same place was five and fifteen miles off, when we knew its distance to be ten; and he won it. So it was with Inglis. You know that wretched estate of Lord Palmerston's, that I pointed out to you on the road from Sligo to Ballyshannon. Some years ago I was positively taken to that estate, by way of shewing me the extreme of misery which the curse of absenteeism inflicts on a country. Well,

you may judge of my surprise, when, some time afterwards, I took up Inglis's book, and found this very place lauded up to the skies, and contrasted with Haslewood—another estate near Sligo, the property of a resident landlord, Mr. Wynne—the owner of which was described as ‘one of those short-sighted landlords.’ Now, I do not know much about farming; but as Mr. Wynne's country had always seemed, to my inexperienced eyes, to be more like England than any thing I had seen in Ireland, I really was a little astonished. Some time after, on passing through Sligo again, I discovered the solution. Inglis had begun his system of cross-examination and leading questions: ‘Was not Lord Palmerston very popular here?’ ‘Was not his domain in fine order?’ ‘Was not he an excellent landlord?’ and so forth; and then sallied forth with his ‘intelligent guide’ to judge with his own eyes as before. His intelligent guide, who had not exactly expected this, was a little taken aback; and being pretty well aware that Lord Palmerston's estate would not pass muster, took him to the next estate, and shewed him a nice little village which had just been built on the side of Benbulbin, by my old friend and schoolfellow, Sir Robert Gore Booth. Inglis might have said, and with very great justice too, that the landlord of that village was, if not the best, at least one of the best landlords in the land; but this, as Sir Robert was a wicked Tory, would have suited neither Inglis's purpose nor that of his intelligent guide, whose object was to procure him the peculiar sort of information he was so anxiously seeking. So the guide suppressed names, but went on examining the people, and helping Inglis to elicit all sorts of praise of their *landlord*, which, in truth, their landlord fully deserved; all this was carefully logged down in Inglis's pocket-book to Lord Palmerston's account, and afterwards appeared as such in print.’ ‘Well, but who can guard against a man who takes you out, and tells you deliberate and very ingenious lies?’ said the Captain. ‘*Vult decipi et decipitur*,’ said the Parson; ‘he looked for a lie, and he found it. You will always do that in Ireland; the people are but too happy to have the chance.’ ‘It is a pity poor Inglis died,’ said the Captain. ‘Lord Palmerston could have done no less for so thick-and-thin a supporter than give him a jolly good situation in the Foreign Affairs.’ ‘He would have made a first-rate ambassador,’ said the Parson; ‘he was just the fellow to lie abroad for the good of his country.’”

Mr. Newland, as we have said, is a Tory, or something of the species; and here are *his* notions of “Justice to Ireland.”

“‘Upon my soul,’ said the Captain, ‘there is a great deal of truth in this. John Bull, worthy, honest, conceited old gentleman, is fully convinced that no one can enjoy, or ought to enjoy, one single day's comfort or happiness in any other habiliments than his own wide-skirted blue coat, broad-brimmed, flat-crowned hat, and brown-topped boots; he has, in his wonderful generosity, fitted out poor Paddy with a full suit of his own as good as new, and now gets thoroughly scandalised that his jaunty cousin has cocked the steady, sober old hat

over one eye, trod the respectable boots down at heel, and is trailing the venerated blue coat through the mire, with a flourish of sticks, and a 'Hooroo! who'll dare to tread on that?' I remember, when I was ten years old, a fox-hunting old uncle of mine rigged me out in a pair of top-boots and buckskin breeches, just like his own; and the first thing I did with them was to put them on for an evening party. If John really has Paddy's welfare at heart, he will not stick him up with such manly absurdities, but fit him out with a good round boy's jacket, send him to school, give him a little birch and plenty of kindness, and by and by he will wear his long-tailed coat with the best of them."

The old woman's wish about the mould-candles in the following, our author says, is the genuine property of his friend Sir Charles Taylor:

"The Squire's advent was a thing as earnestly watched for by the beggars, as the rising of the sun by the Mussulman Arab; for, in truth, the worthy man's liberality got far the start of his judgment, and shillings and sixpences flowed from both pockets with indiscriminate profusion. And there they stood in every variety of age, sex, and condition: old and young, men and women; widows, whose strapping husbands were waiting for them round the corner; and desolate orphans, whose parents wanted money for the next shebeen house. Here and there stood modest poverty; but its voice was lost in the clamour, and seldom reached the Squire's ear. Yet, disgusting as this scene was, it was not without its scraps of Irish humour. 'May every hair in your honour's head,' said a wild old lady, looking at his powdered and pomatumed locks—'May every hair in your honour's head be a mould-candle to light your sowl to glory.' And as he bowed, hat in hand, in acknowledgment, and disclosed his bare crown—'May the blessed Vargin give you more of them.'"

SHORT NOTICES.

DR. CROOKALL has edited three of a series of *Italian Masses* (Burns and Lambert), by Casali, Fazzini, and others, which may be strongly recommended to choirs who would cultivate a style of music at once religious in tone and scientifically good. They are for four voices, with an easy organ accompaniment, and, above all, of a proper length. At the same time, we should caution those who are not already familiar with the Italian music of this school, against judging of their merits from a bare performance of the accompaniments on the piano-forte or organ. They are essentially vocal compositions, adapted to voices of ordinary compass and flexibility, and to be appreciated must be *sung*. They are not the kind of works which will please those who love vocal display or dashing accompaniments, who think

that the perfection of ecclesiastical music is to be found in the solos of professional, or semi-professional, women singers, and which in practice varies between the theatrical and the vulgar. Wherever, on the other hand, Protestants are banished from our choirs, and the first object of singers and organists is the edification of the congregation, Dr. Crookall's publications cannot fail to be highly appreciated.

The recently published volume of the Oratory *Lives of the Saints* (Richardson) contains those of three great Jesuit missionaries, Fathers Segneri, Pinamonti, and de Britto. Father Segneri is well known as one of the most admirable devotional writers of a body so wonderfully fertile in every thing that relates to the guidance of souls, and his works are moreover regarded as models of purity in the Italian language. Father Pinamonti was the dear friend of Segneri, and like him, greatly distinguished for his writings. Father de Britto, of whom a striking portrait is given in the volume, was martyred in the East. Many readers will think this one of the most interesting volumes yet published in the series. Father Faber has prefixed to it a characteristic essay on Catholic Home Missions.

The Duties and Happiness of Domestic Service ; or a Sister of Mercy giving Instructions to the Inmates of the House of Mercy under her care (Dolman), hardly gives a fair idea of the contents of the little volume so designated. It was compiled for the use of the House of Mercy at Handsworth, by a priest of the diocese of Birmingham, and is, in fact, a complete outline of Christian duties in general, with an application to the circumstances of those for whom it is particularly designed. A vein of good sense and good feeling runs through the whole, and the work will make a very acceptable addition to a Catholic lending-library, and a present to persons engaged in any kind of service.

We have not for some time seen an abler little book than Mr. Thring's *Elements of Grammar taught in English* (Macmillan, Cambridge). The principles of all grammar are stated with a precision and a perpetual reference to their origin in the nature of language, as an exponent of thought, which advantageously distinguish Mr. Thring's treatise from all others that we know of. In the hands of a competent teacher, we have no doubt that it would greatly facilitate the learner's progress in a path by no means too easy, even when smoothest.

Two good lithographs, by Belgian artists, of the *Venerable Paul of the Cross*, founder of the Passionists, and *Monsignor Strambi*, of the same congregation, are now on sale by the English Catholic booksellers. They are both interesting portraits. That of the venerable Paul is a noble head, full of intellectual power and Christian benignity.

Those who would see at one view some astonishing instances of the tone and truthfulness of Protestant polemics should consult the *Dublin Review* for October. Three articles on "Pascal the Younger,"

No-Popery Novels, and the *Guardian's* Theory of Lying, are devoted to the exposure of a few of the phenomena of present controversy. Two other articles shew up the divided condition of the Establishment; and another exposes the modesty with which Englishmen, while persecuting English Catholics at home, claim a right to build a church for English Protestants in the Holy City itself. On the whole, the number offers as varied a contribution to the history of controversy as could well be found in the same space.

We recommend to our gardening and agricultural readers a very useful manual in the *Cottage Gardener's Dictionary*, edited by Mr. Johnson (Orr and Co.). It is published in weekly numbers and monthly parts, and about one-half of the entire work is now issued, at a very moderate price. No other book of the kind exists at such a cost, and brought down to the latest discoveries (as they may fairly be called) in gardening. The Dictionary embraces, in fact, every species of information requisite for the gardener, with the scientific names of every plant of importance, their description, colour, height, period of blooming and fruiting, with concise and *intelligible* directions for their culture. The writers are some of the most distinguished gardeners of the day.

The *Clifton Tracts* (Burns and Lambert) continue their useful and successful career. "Know Popery," one of the last issued, is especially pointed and amusing. Another number of the very clever series on Catholic Ceremonial has also appeared.

Mr. Gawthorn has published a *Statement of the whole Case*, between himself, the "Archbishop of Canterbury," and Mr. Beresford Hope (Richardson). Undoubtedly, if Mr. Gawthorn has done wrong, the Protestant public and the Protestant millionaire have taken good care to victimise him to their hearts' content.

Correspondence.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

THE author of the article in question, in his summary of the Roman decisions on the subject, has omitted a more recent one than either of those given by him; namely, a reply made to an application from his Eminence Mgr. Gousset, the present Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims, one of the greatest living authorities on the subject of moral theology. It was made in 1842, and was to this effect: Is magnetism lawful, guarding against abuses, and disclaiming all compact with the devil? The Cardinal Grand Penitentiary replied that this question *had not yet been maturely weighed* by the Roman court, and that an answer could not be given so quickly. Hence Mgr. Gousset concludes in his great work on Moral Theology (de 1^o præcepto decalogi), "Having received no other answer, we think that *the use of magnetism ought to be tolerated until*

Rome has pronounced." He, however, prescribes several conditions, as that the magnetiser and the patient should be in good faith, that they should act with decency and propriety, and should renounce all dealings with the devil.

P. Gerry, S. J., Professor of Moral Theology in the Roman College in 1847-48, in his *Compendium of Moral Theology* (in eodem loco) (recently published, by the way, by Perisse Frères in Paris), concludes the above summary of this part of the case by saying, "we think that in practice this opinion must be adhered to." ROMANUS.

[We have omitted the concluding paragraph of our correspondent's letter, in which he objects to the discussion of such a subject as animal magnetism in the pages of the *Rambler*. He has evidently, as we think, misconceived the letter to which he refers, from Cardinal Castracane, in reply to Mgr. Gousset. The Cardinal informs the archbishop that the Inquisition has not decided on the *general question of magnetism*, and refers to the condemnation of its use in all those cases in which the Holy Office had been applied to. We should also call the attention of *Romanus* to the fact, that the Cardinal refers to the *public journals* as appropriate vehicles for making known the decrees of the Inquisition. We cannot but think that Mgr. Gousset's question was anticipated in those put by the Bishop of Lausanne, and distinctly answered by the Holy Office. Mgr. Gousset himself considers that it was not. Compare his own statement, that he asked if, "*sepositis rei abusibus, rejectoque omni cum dæmone fœdere, il était permis d'exercer le magnétisme animal, ou d'y recourir, en l'envisageant comme un remède que l'on croit utile à la santé*;" with the first and fourth questions put by the Bishop of Lausanne. See *Rambler* for October last, p. 323.]

Ecclesiastical Register.

BEATIFICATION OF FATHER PETER CLAVER.

On the 21st of September, the solemn function of the beatification of the venerable servant of God, Peter Claver, was celebrated in the patriarchal basilica of the Vatican.

At the exterior porch, where the Pope gives the solemn benediction, was displayed a standard, representing the blessed Claver recommending to God the poor negroes whom he leaves upon earth deprived of all human succour. This tableau bore the following inscription:

A DEO OPTIMO MAXIMO.

Petrus in æternæ lucis sinum accersitus,
Jesu Christo Servatori generis humani
Mauros, quos omni ope destitutos deserit,
enixa obsecratione commendat.

At the principal gate of the basilica, under the portico, was to be seen another tableau, with this inscription:

Mauri ad Neocarthagenas ex Africâ appellentes
Petrum, corpore quidem ægroto
at alacri eos animo ad litus præsolantem,
docilesque de navi ad ejus pedes corruunt.

On the two lateral gates we read two verses of the holy Scripture, one taken from the book of Job, cap. 22: "Auris audiens beatificabit me . . . eo quod liberâsem pauperem vociferantem et pupillum cui non erat adjutor. Oculus fui cæco et pes claudo. Pater eram pauperum." The other verse was borrowed from Psalm lxxi.: "Coram illo procident Æthiopes . . . et usuris et iniquitate redimet animas eorum et honorabile nomen eorum coram illo."

The pilasters of the great nave were covered with magnificent draperies in red damask. The immense platform, which extended from the confessional of the holy Apostles to the altar of the chair, had assumed, under the intelligent direction of the Chevalier Sarti, a novel and most graceful appearance. On either side were placed two paintings, representing the principal miracles of the beatified father. At the bottom of the apse, above the chair of St. Peter, was the portrait of the blessed Claver. The splendour of this decoration was heightened by the beauty of the illumination. The finest effect was produced by two long lines of lights, which were displayed around the portrait of the blessed Claver.

At half-past ten their Eminences the Cardinals, the Chapter of St. Peter's, and the Reverend Consultors of the Rites, took their places. Then the most Rev. P. Roothaan, General of the Society of Jesus, was presented to Cardinal Lambruschini, as the Prefect of the Congregation, and in a discourse on the merits of the venerable servant of God, he demanded that the brief of beatification should be promulgated. After the reading of the brief, the "Te Deum" was solemnly chanted, during which the portrait of the blessed Father was displayed, the bells sounding, and the cannon firing from the Castle of St. Angelo. The versicle and collect proper for the beatified were recited by Monsignor Cardelli, Archbishop of Acrida, who celebrated a Pontifical High Mass. Our most Holy Father the Pope came to venerate the image of the beatified in the evening. After vespers he received the usual oblations, and stopped some time to admire the beauty of the paintings and decorations. In the evening the façade of the house and church of the Jesuits was illuminated.

LETTERS APOSTOLIC FOR THE BEATIFICATION OF THE VEN. PETER
CLAVER, OF THE COMPANY OF JESUS.

PIUS IX. POPE.

For a perpetual remembrance of the thing.

THE essence of Christian charity—the power which distinguishes it—is that of urging the hearts which it inflames to undertake the most arduous and most difficult enterprises for the glory of God and for the spiritual and corporeal good of our neighbour, by communicating to them an extraordinary energy, truly superior to mortal nature. And this, throughout all ages, since the days of the first preachers of the Gospel, manifestly appears in all those men remarkable for their holiness—those generous labourers whom the Divine Father of the household has never ceased to send into his harvest. Inflamed with the fire of Christian charity, they have accomplished so many and such great things, they have rendered such splendid services in all the ranks of the human family, that the deceptive and vain philosophy of our time—that enemy of the cross of Christ—cannot enter into a parallel with those heroes, or, without incurring certain confusion, venture to boast of producing such works or such benefits. Now, amongst those heroic men, animated with the spirit of the Apostles, who, since the discovery

of the Western Indies, have been seen cultivating without ceasing that new field open to their zeal, and civilising and winning to Jesus Christ the savage people of these countries, and leaving amongst them testimonies of Christian charity so profound and so glorious, the venerable servant of God, Peter Claver, professed priest of the Society of Jesus, has justly rendered himself remarkable. Born at Verdu, a town in Catalonia, in the diocese of Salsona, in the Spanish province of Tarragona, he was scarcely seventeen years of age, when, in order to consecrate himself more closely to God, he sought to enter into the Society of Jesus. He was admitted, and after his novitiate he repaired to Majorca, there to study literature and philosophy. There he met with the blessed Alphonsus Rodriguez, brother coadjutor of the Society, in whose intimacy he learned to what a serious ministry, and to what labours, he had been called by the divine will. In fact, in the year 1610, by the will of God, and by the orders of his superiors, he set out for the kingdom of New Granada, in South America, where he was ordained priest, and where he concluded his theological studies. From this period he dwelt at Carthage, on the sea of the Antilles, a mart where merchants, openly devoted to the infamous slave-trade, conducted every year, like wretched cattle, ten or twelve thousand poor slaves, captured chiefly on the African coasts, and sold them to the highest bidder. Touched with compassion towards these unfortunates, the venerable Peter, devoting to them his existence, and consecrating himself to them by a vow, laboured constantly, during more than forty years, in instructing and baptising them, sustained by an invincible courage in the midst of difficulties and unheard-of privations. Thus did he singly, by his charity alone, gain over to Christ and to the Church a multitude of negroes so vast, that the number of them is reckoned at several hundreds of thousands. But he did not confine himself to spreading true religion in their souls; he occupied himself also with their corporal wants. How could his piety avoid embracing with his solicitude these unhappy creatures, emaciated as they were by the most horrible misery? At the news of each disembarkation of slaves, he rushed to the spot; he clasped in his arms these outcasts of freedom, now reduced by violence to the most cruel servitude. He eagerly exerted himself to obtain for them, as far as he could, the help they so much needed. To the naked he gave clothes, to the hungry he supplied food, to the sick remedies; and even amongst the latter, if he found some of them infected with the plague, it was to them that he delighted to devote himself, without any care for his own safety. The more repugnance and disgust he felt in the midst of such horrible exhalations and filth, the more did he redouble the efforts of a charity ever victorious. And as if these prodigious exertions on behalf of the suffering negroes had been but trifling toils, he moreover came to the aid of the inhabitants of Carthage, and of such strangers as occasionally sojourned in that city. He won back to virtue and temperance those who led a licentious life. He applied himself to bring back heretics to the true faith—to make Mahometans pass free from the slavery of their superstitions to the blessed liberty of Christ. After so many labours, prolonged far into the night, he devoted to rest only the smallest portion of the night which still remained, and consecrated the rest to the honour of God, his Virgin Mother, the angels and saints. The divine charity which consumed him was so intense that, in the midst of his occupations, he always appeared rapt in God. As he was sweet and affable towards other men, especially the simple, so was he hard and severe towards himself, adding to so many labours continued mortification, like one accustomed from infancy to reduce his

body to subjection by the most austere life. This venerable servant of God, full of the merits of so many virtues, and especially of so many excellent works of charity, at length met a death worthy of so holy a life on the 4th day of the ides of September, in the year 1654. The fame of his sanctity having spread far and wide, his cause was referred to our venerable brothers, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, of the Congregation of Sacred Rites; and the process of his virtues having been carefully drawn up, Benedict XIV., our predecessor, of glorious memory, after having addressed to God fervent prayers, decreed the heroism of those virtues by a public decree of the 8th of the kalends of October, in the year 1747. Then, when we had been called, notwithstanding our unworthiness, to the government of the Church, two of the miracles attributed to the prayers of the venerable Peter having been proved before us, with the advice of the consultors, and the judgment of the cardinals placed over the Sacred Rites, we confirmed the truth of the same by a decree dated the 4th of the kalends of the month of September, in the year 1848. Finally, assembled in our presence on the morrow of the ides of May of the present year, the Cardinals of the same Congregation unanimously declared, after having collected the suffrages of the consultors, that we might, when it seemed good to us, place the aforesaid servant of God in the rank of the blessed, pending the celebration of his solemn canonisation. Therefore, at the prayer of the whole Society of Jesus, with the counsel and consent of the same Congregation of Cardinals, by our apostolic authority, and by the tenor of these presents, we permit that the same servant of God, Peter Claver, professed priest of the Society of Jesus, be for the future called by the name of "Blessed;" that his body and his relics be exposed publicly to the veneration of the faithful, without, however, their being permitted to introduce them into the public supplications. Moreover, we permit, by our same Apostolic authority, to be recited every year the Office and Mass *Commune Confessoris non Pontificis*, with the proper prayers approved by us, conformable to the rubrics of the Missal and the Roman Breviary. We only grant the recital of this office to the city and the diocese of Carthage, to be performed in all the churches where the Society of Jesus is established, on the 9th of September, by all the faithful, as well Seculars as Regulars, who are held to canonical hours as to Masses. We allow all priests to recite them who shall officiate in churches where the feast shall be kept. Lastly, we concede that within a year from the date of these presents, the solemnity of the beatification of the servant of God, Peter Claver, be celebrated for the first time in the churches of the diocese and of the Society mentioned above, with the Office and the Masses, with the rite of a greater double, which we ordain to be done on the day which the ordinary superiors shall prescribe after the same solemnity shall have taken place in the basilica of the Vatican—the constitutions and apostolic ordinations, decrees upon non-worship, and all other things to the contrary, notwithstanding. And we direct that copies of the present letters, even printed—provided that they be subscribed with the hand of the secretary of the above-mentioned Congregation, and guaranteed by the seal of his prefect—be received with the same credit, even in the judiciary order, that they would have towards these present letters exhibited as a testimony of our will.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 16th of the month of July, 1850, the fifth year of our Pontificate.

A. CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI,

Loco ✠ sigilli,

ALLOCATION OF THE POPE ON SEPTEMBER 5.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPE IX.
ALLOCUTIO HABITA IN CONSISTORIO SECRETO DIE V. SEPTEMBRIS
ANNO MDCCCLI.

VENERABILES FRATRES,—Quibus luctuosissimis perturbationibus et calamitatibus ob tristissimas rerum conversiones multos per annos incluta Hispana Natio de Catholica Ecclesia et hac S. Sede tot illustribus gloriosissimisque factis optime merita, miserandum in modum fuerit exagitata, quæque gravissima, et numquam satis deploranda mala amplis-imini illius Regni Ecclesiis, Episcopatibus, Capitulis, Monasteriis, cunctoque Clero, Populoque fideli incubuerint, et quæ seva deinde clades Catholicam Religionem, Sacrorum Antistites, ecclesiasticosque viros afflixerit, divexarit, quæque adversus sacratiora Ecclesiæ jura, ejusque bona, libertates, et adversus hujus Apostolicæ Sedis dignitatem auctoritatemque ibidem fuerint perpetrata, universo, qua late patet, terrarum orbi, ac Vobis multo magis compertum exploratumque est, Venerabiles Fratres. Atque optime scitis quanta cura et studio rec. me. Gregorius XVI. prædecessor Noster expostulationes, querimonias, preces adhibuerit, nihilque intentatum reliquerit, ut afflictis illic ac prostratis religionis rebus succurreret, mederetur, et consuleret. Neque ignoratis, qua sollicitudine Nos, vix dum licet immerentes, inscrutabili Dei judicio in ejusdem Decessoris Nostri locum suffecti, et in hac sublimi Principis Apostolorum Cathedra collocati fuimus, præcipuas paterni Animi Nostri curas cogitationesque ad clarissimam illam Nationem convertimus, quo ecclesiasticas ibi res, quantum fieri posset, ad Sacrorum Canonum normam componere, et inflicta Ecclesiæ vulnera sanare possemus. Quamobrem postquam certiores facti fuimus, præcipuas quasdam, ac portiores condiciones et cautiones a Nobis antea præscriptas fuisse admisras, ac in tuto positas, Carissimæ in Christo Filie Nostræ Mariæ Elisabeth postulationibus alacri ac libentissimo animo obsecundantes ad Eam, ut probe nostis, misimus Venerabilem Fratrem Joannem Archiepiscopum Thessalonicensem opportunis facultatibus et instructionibus munitum, qui apud ipsam Catholicam Majestatem Apostolici Delegati, ac deinde, sub tempore Nostri et hujus S. Sedis Nuntii munus obiret, omnemque suam operam ecclesiasticis ibi negotiis tractandis, ordinandis, sedulo ac sollicitè impenderet. Ac meministis, Venerabiles Fratres, nihil Nobis potius, nihil antiquius fuisse, quam illius Regni Ecclesias legitimo pastore a longo jam tempore pene omnes misere viduatis idoneis Antistitibus in primis committere, Nostrasque in id curas, Deo bene juvante, et Ipsius Carissimæ in Christo Filie Nostræ opera, non levi certe animi Nostri consolatione optatum exitum habuisse.

Jam vero Vobis significamus Nostras sollicitudines pro aliis sacris ecclesiasticisque illius Regni rebus componendis susceptas, ob propensum præsertim ejusdem Carissimæ in Christo Filie Nostræ in Religionis bonam voluntatem haud cecidisse irritas. Siquidem post diuturnam operosamque tractationem Conventio inter Nos et Reginam Catholicam est inita, quam delecti ex utraque parte Plenipotentarii subscripserunt, Nomine quidem Nostro idem Venerabilis Frater Archiepiscopus Thessalonicensis, Nomine autem Reginae dilectus Filius nobilis Vir Eques Emmanuel Bertran de Lis a publicis Majestatis suæ negotiis. Quam Conventionem ab eadem Regina, et a Nobis ipsis, audito consilio VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalium Congregationis negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis propositæ, jam ratam habitam, Vobis exhiberi mandavimus una cum Apos-

toliceis Nostris Litteris, quibus Conventionem ipsam confirmavimus, ut omnia clarius et plenius agnoscere possitis.

Illud quidem Nobis vel maxime cordi fuit, ut sanctissimæ nostræ religionis incolumitati, et spiritualibus Ecclesiæ rebus studiosissime consuleremus. Itaque constitutum perspicietis, Catholicam Religionem cum omnibus suis juribus, quibus ex divina sua institutione et Sacrorum Canonum sanctione potitur, ita unice in eo Regno, veluti antea vigere ac dominari debere, ut omnis alius cultus plane sit amotus et interdictus. Hinc cautum quoque est, ut instituendi ac docendi ratio in cunctis tum Universitatibus, tum Collegiis, tum Seminariis, tum publicis privatisque scholis cum ejusdem Catholica religionis doctrina plane congruat, atque Episcopi aliique Diocesani Antistites, qui ex proprii ministerii officio in Catholicæ doctrinæ puritatem tuendam propagandam, et in christianam juventutis educationem procurandam totis viribus incumbere debent, nullo prorsus umquam præpediantur impedimento, quominus publicis etiam scholis sedulo advigilare, et in illas pastoralis sui muneris partes libere exercere possint. Ac pari studio ecclesiasticæ auctoritatis libertatem dignitatemque asserendam curavimus. Etenim non solum statutum est Sacrorum præsertim Antistites ad Episcopalem eorum jurisdictionem exercendam plena libertate pollere, quo Catholicam fidem, et ecclesiasticam disciplinam tueri, et morum honestatem in Christiano populo tutari, et optimam juvenum, eorum potissimum qui in sortem Domini vocantur, institutionem procurare, et alia omnia proprii ministerii munera explere valeant; verum etiam decretum est omnes Regni Magistratus eorum operam præstare debere, quo ab omnibus Ecclesiasticæ auctoritati et dignitati debitus exhibetur honor, observantia, et obedientia. Accedit etiam, ut præstantissima Regina, ejusque Gubernium iisdem Episcopis valido suo patrocinio, et præsidio omnem opem ferre profiteantur, cum ab ipsis pro pastoralis munere illorum potissimum hominum improbitas est cohibenda, et coercenda audacia, qui fidelium mentes pervertere, moresque corrumpere nefarie commoliuntur, et a proprio grege detestabilis, ac dira perversorum librorum pestis atque perniciies est avertenda ac profliganda. Et quoniam relatum ad Nos est, ex nova diocesum divisione majora spiritualia bona in illius Regni fideles redundare, iccirco novam hujusmodi circumscriptionem nostra auctoritate et ipsius Reginæ consensu peragendam statuimus, atque Apostolicas de hac re suo tempore proferemus Litteras, postquam ea omnia fuerint perspecta, et statuta, quæ ad rem ipsam perficiendam sunt necessaria. Cum autem Religiosæ Familiæ pie institutæ ac recte administratæ maximo sint Ecclesiæ et civili societati usui et ornamento, quantum in Nobis fuit haud omisimus eniti, ut illic Regulares Ordines conserventur, restituantur, augeantur. Atque in eam profecto spem erigimur fore, ut propter avitam ejusdem Carissimæ in Christo Filiæ Nostræ pietatem, et eximiam Hispaniæ Nationis religionem ipsi Regulares Ordines ibi pristina dignitate ac splendore fruantur. Ne quid autem Religionis bono quavis ratione officere possit, non solum constitutum est, Leges, Ordinationes, et Decreta quæcumque Conventioni adversantia de medio sublata omnino esse ac penitus abrogata, verum etiam sancitum, ut cetera omnia, quæ ad Ecclesiasticas res et personas pertinent, de quibus in Conventione nulla est habita mentio, juxta canonicam, et vigentem Ecclesiæ disciplinam exigî, et administrari plane debeant.

Nec vero ea prætermisimus, quæ ad temporale Ecclesiæ bonum posunt pertinere. Omni enim studio, et contentione vindicandum, ac tuendum curavimus jus, quo Ecclesia pollet, acquirendi scilicet, et possidendi quæcumque bona stabilia et frugifera, veluti innumera prope Conciliorum acta Sanctorum Patrum sententiæ et exempla, et Præde-

cessorum Nostrorum Constitutiones apertissime loquuntur, sapientissime docent et demonstrant. Atque utinam ubique gentium, ubique terrarum possessiones Deo, ejusque Sanctæ Ecclesiæ dicatæ semper inviolatæ fuissent, et homines debita illas reverentia essent prosequuti! Equidem haud cogemur defflere plurima, omnibusque notissima mala et damna in civilem ipsam societatem derivata ex injusta prorsus et sacrilega Ecclesiasticarum rerum, ac bonorum spoliatio et direptione, quæ ad funestissimos quoque ac perniciosissimos *Socialismi et Communismi* errores fovendos magna ex parte viam munivit. Jam porro in Conventione constabilitum firmatumque conspicietis Ecclesiæ jus novas acquirendi possessiones, ac simul sancitum, ut proprietas honorum omnium, quæ vel in præsentia possidet, vel in posterum acquireret, integra et inviolabilis omnino habeatur atque persistat. Hinc constitutum etiam fuit, ut, nulla interposita mora, Ecclesiæ illa omnia statim restituantur bona, quæ nondum divendita fuere. Verum cum ex gravibus ac fide dignis testimoniis acceperimus, nonnulla ex iisdem bonis nondum alienatis ita in deterius esse prolapsa, et administrationis incommodis obnoxia, ut evidens constet Ecclesiæ utilitas, si illorum pretium in publici æris alieni redditus nunquam quavis alia ratione transferendos convertatur, ejusmodi permutationi indulgendum esse censuimus, postquam vero bona ipsa fuerint Ecclesiæ restituta.

Omnem quidem dedimus operam, ut Episcopi, Capitula, Seminaria, Parochi congruis, ac stabilibus potiantur redditibus, qui Ecclesiæ perpetuo addicti, ab ea libere erunt administrandi. Et si vero hi redditus cum antiqua Hispani Cleri dote conferri non possint, et ob temporum asperitatem minores, quam Nos optavissemus, existant; tamen probe noscentes, qua singulari religione et pietate idem Hispaniorum Clerus summopere præstet, plane non dubitamus, quin ipse in divina voluntate conquiescens, et omni virtutum genere magis in dies undique refulgens, in vineam Domini naviter scienterque excolendam alacriori usque solertia et studio incumbat, cum præsertim per ecclesiasticam libertatem in Conventione sancitam iis omnibus expeditus sit impedimentis, quæ antea libero sacri ministerii exercitio adversabantur, atque ita Populorum obsequium, amorem, et venerationem sibi magis magisque conciliet et devinciat. Ceterum cum plenum ac liberum acquirendi ac possidendi jus fuerit sancitum ac servatum, patet Hispanis Ecclesiis aditus ad ampliores obtinendos redditus, quibus et majori divini cultus splendori et decentiori Cleri sustentationi facilius et commodius consulatur. Atque id felicioribus temporibus ex regia Carissimæ in Christo Filiae Nostræ munificentia, ejusque Gubernii studio, et ex egregia ac perspecta Hispaniæ Nationis religione futurum Nobis pollicemur. Ex iis, quæ raptim cursimque commemoravimus, intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres, quo studio Nostras omnes curas in ecclesiasticis Hispaniæ rebus instaurandis posuerimus, ac futurum confidimus, ut, divina adspirante gratia, in amplissimo illo Regno Catholica Ecclesia, ejusque salutaris doctrina quotidie magis latissime dominetur, vigeat, et efflorescat.

Nunc vero noscatis velimus, Dilectissimum in Christo Filium Nostrum Leopoldum II. Magnum Etruriæ Ducem et Lucensium Ducem pro egregia sua pietate vehementer optasse, ut vigentes in Etruria legis quodammodo ordinari et componi possent cum iis omnibus, quæ ecclesiasticas leges respiciunt. Itaque enixis precibus a Nobis efflagitavit, ut nonnulla interea temporis conciliare vellemus, cum eidem religiosissimo Principi in animo fixum destinatumque sit, plenam cum hac Apostolica Sede in posterum inire Conventionem, qua in regionibus ei subjectis ecclesiasticarum rerum regimini et rationibus prospere consulatur. Quocirca firma ac certa spe freti fore, ut idem Dilectissimus in Christo

Filius Noster ejusmodi Conventionem juxta Nostra desideria majori qua fieri potest celeritate sit initurus, illius votis obsecundantes aliqua capita a VV. FF. NN. S.R.E. Cardinalibus ejusdem Congregationis Negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis propositæ perpensa, interim constituta fuere, quæ a Nobis, et ab ipso Principe rata habita sunt. Quibus quidem capitibus seu articulis inter cetera constitutum est, ut Episcopi omnem habeant libertatem in iis omnibus peragendis quæ ad sacrum pertinent ministerium, ac in scripta et opera, quæ de rebus ad religionem spectantibus tractant, censuram ferant, ut propriam eorum episcopalem auctoritatem libere adhibeant, ad fideles a prava quavis lectione tum religioni, tum moribus perniciosa arcendos, ac simul cautum, ut omnes cum hac B. Petri Cathedra Catholicæ veritatis et unitatis centro libere communicare valeant, et causæ omnes spirituales et ecclesiasticæ ad sacræ potestatis judicium unice et omnino spectare debeant ex sacrorum Canonum præscripto. Non levi autem jucunditate affecti fuimus, propterea quod idem Dilectissimus in Christo Filius Noster haud omisit Nobis polliceri et profiteri, se omnem suam opem et operam esse collaturum ad sanctissimam nostram religionem tutandam, ad divinum cultum tuendum, et ad publicam morum honestatem fovendam, ac valido suo auxilio præsto futurum, quo Sacrorum Antistites episcopalem eorum auctoritatem libere exerceant. Quocirca confidimus, ut, Deo bene juvante, earum, quas indulsimus, rerum usus in Ecclesiæ utilitatem cedat, iis insuper difficultatibus penitus amotis, quæ hucusque ejusdem Ecclesiæ libertati obstiterunt.

Denique certiores Vos facimus, Nostras jam convertisse curas ad Catholicæ religionis res in longinqua regione componendas, ac Nos magna spe sustentari fore, ut Conventio possit iniiri, quæ juxta Nostra et vestra desideria Ecclesiæ juribus, rationibus, ac prosperitati respondeat. Ac vel maxime optarem, ut hujusmodi exemplum omnes earum dissitarum partium regiones, quarum populos præcipuo caritatis affectu in Domino prosequimur, imitari properarent, quo penitus averterentur plurima et maxima damna, quibus in nonnullis præsertim earundem partium regionibus immaculata Christi sponsa cum summo animi Nostri dolore affligitur ac divexatur. Atque hic haud possumus, quin illis Venerabilibus Fratribus vehementer gratulemur, eisque meritas debitasque tribuamus laudes, qui in tristissima licet conditione ibi constituti, tamen haud omittunt episcopali eorum zelo et firmitate Ecclesiæ causam strenue tueri, ejusque jura impavide defendere, ac dilectarum ovium saluti sollicitè prospicere.

Hæc erant, Venerabiles Fratres, quæ Vobis hodierno die significanda existimavimus. Reliquum est, ut nunquam desinamus dies noctesque in humilitate cordis Nostri, et in sinceritate fidei, firmitate spei, et caritatis ardore assiduas clementissimo misericordiarum Patri adhibere preces, ut omnipotenti sua dextera, quæ mari et ventis imperat, Ecclesiam suam sanctam a tantis, quibus jactatur, procellis eripiat, eamque solis ortu, usque ad occasum novis, ac splendoribus triumphis exornet et augeat.

EXECUTION OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST IN CHINA.

A LETTER from Hong-Kong, addressed to the *Univers*, gives the following details of the execution of M. Schœffler, a missionary priest:

“ On the 4th May, about noon, by order of the grand mandarin, elephants and horses were prepared, and two regiments of satellites were under arms. The muskets were loaded, and every one expected

that it was an expedition against the rebels that was being fitted out, or that an attack was to be made on the haunt of some brigands. It was soon, however, understood that all these preparations had been ordered for the execution of M. Schœffler. The mandarin, fearing that the Christians would endeavour to rescue their missionary by force, wished to intimidate them by this display of troops. When his intentions were known, all the town shewed the greatest affliction. The gaolers, the prisoners, and all those who had had any connexion with the missionary, expressed their sorrow and regret. M. Schœffler, on the contrary, was smiling with delight, and he prepared to walk to the place of execution with greater ease by dressing himself as lightly as possible. The mandarin was apprehensive of a riot, and he took up his position on the ramparts, surrounded by his troops, all ready for action. The execution took place outside the town. The *cortège* of the martyr was arranged in the following manner. Before him marched a soldier, carrying a board affixed to a pole, on which was written, 'Notwithstanding the severe prohibition against the religion of Jesus, a European priest named Augustin has dared to come here clandestinely to preach and seduce the people. When arrested, he confessed every thing: his crime is evident. Let Augustin have his head cut off, and thrown into the river. Fourth year of Tu Du; first of the third moon.' Eight soldiers, with drawn sabres, marched by the side of M. Schœffler; one hundred men, armed with muskets or lances, formed the head of the procession; two elephants formed the rear guard. The martyr held up his chains when walking: he walked quickly, as if hastening towards his triumph, and continually offered up thanksgivings. He was surrounded by an immense crowd. The greater number of these pagans were struck with religious admiration; there were some, however, who railed and blasphemed. On arriving at the place of execution the martyr fell on his knees, kissed the crucifix three times, and at the request of the executioner, he took off his coat, and turned down the collar of his shirt. The executioner having afterwards tied his hands behind his back, the martyr said to him, 'Do your business as quickly as possible.' 'No, no,' replied the mandarin, who was informed of what M. Schœffler had said; 'follow the signal of the cymbal, and only strike at the third sound.' The signal was given: the hand of the executioner trembled. He struck three blows of his sabre on the neck of his victim, and was at length obliged to cut the flesh with a knife, in order to detach the head from the body. In Cochin China those who are present at executions are accustomed to disperse immediately it is over; but on this occasion, although the greater number present were pagans—for there are very few Christians at Son Tay—they rushed forward to collect some drops of the blood, and to get some portion of the garments of the martyr. It was remarked that an inferior mandarin, a pagan, before the execution, threw a coat of white silk and a piece of white linen at the feet of the martyr, in the hope that it would be stained with his blood. M. Schœffler, thinking, doubtless, that they belonged to some Christian, took them up, and placed them inside his shirt next his heart. When the chief mandarin was informed of what his subordinate had done, he ordered him to receive several blows with a stick; he, however, went off very delighted with the possession of his precious relics. The Christians obtained the body of M. Schœffler; but the head was thrown into the river, and had not been found when the above letter was written."

RULES OF THE CATHOLIC DEFENCE ASSOCIATION,

ADOPTED AT THE MEETING IN DUBLIN ON THE 17TH OCT.

1. THAT as one of the great objects of this Association is to vindicate and develop Catholic doctrines and practices, so much misrepresented, it shall consist exclusively of members of the Catholic Church, who are recommended to solicit by their prayers the blessing of Heaven on its labours.—2. All Catholics who have paid to the treasurers the first annual subscription of one pound or upwards, previous to the 17th October instant, shall be members of, and entitled to speak and vote at the public meetings of, the Association, and be qualified to be chosen or elected members of the committee.—3. All Catholics who pay an annual subscription of one pound or upwards, after the 16th of October, 1851, on being moved and seconded by members, shall be eligible to be enrolled as members of the Association, with similar privileges.—4. All Catholics who shall have collected and paid one pound or upwards towards the funds of the Association shall be eligible as members, and be entitled to vote and speak at all the meetings of the Association.—5. All Catholics who shall pay one shilling, and less than one pound, shall be entitled to be enrolled as members, to be present at all the public meetings of the Association.—6. All Archbishops, Bishops, and clergymen shall be *ex-officio* members of the Association, on intimating to the secretary a wish to be enrolled as such.—7. The affairs of the Association to be conducted for the present by a general committee, consisting of the Archbishops and Bishops, and the following peers, members of parliament, clergy, and laymen, fifteen to form a quorum. (Here follows the list).—8. The general committee to have power to select from amongst themselves sub-committees for the purposes of the Association.—9. All moneys received to be lodged in the Hibernian Bank, to the credit of his Grace the Primate, the Archbishop of Tuam, the Bishop of Meath, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, the Hon. E. Preston, John Reynolds, Esq., M.P., and John Clarke, Esq.—10. No sum of money to be paid away without the sanction of a majority of the finance committee, duly convened for that purpose, and on a check signed either by his Grace the Primate, or his Grace the Archbishop of Tuam, or the Bishop of Meath, and two others of the trustees.—11. The accounts to be audited once every three months by two auditors appointed by the general committee of the Association.—12. The accounts, when audited, to be open to the inspection of all the members of the Association.—13. All the officers, clerks, and servants of the Association to be appointed by, and to be under the control of, the general committee.—14. All public meetings of the Association shall be held at such times and in such places as the majority of the general committee, duly convened for that purpose, shall determine.—15. The general committee shall meet in the city of Dublin once a month for the disposal of business.—16. The secretary shall summon a special general meeting of the committee at any time, on a requisition in writing stating the objects of the meeting, and signed by at least five members of the committee, of whom one shall be an Archbishop or Bishop, and of which meeting seven days' notice must be given.—17. No member of the Association to be allowed to address the public meeting more than once upon any question, except the mover of an original resolution, who shall have the right of reply.—18. An amendment may be proposed on any original motion; but no second amendment shall be received until the first is disposed of.—19. A motion of adjournment may be proposed at any time, except when a member is addressing the meeting.—20. A member may at any time call another member to order, and the decision of the chairman on all questions of order to be final.—21. No resolution to be proposed at any public meeting, except a copy of the same be lodged with the secretary five days before the meeting.

✠ PAUL, Archbishop of Armagh, and
Primate of all Ireland.

JOHN REYNOLDS,	} Hon. Secretaries.
JOHN SADLEIR,	
WILLIAM KEOGH,	

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.

DECEMBER 1851.

PART XLVIII.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

No. III.—*The Altar and its Furniture: the Oblations.*

As the living temples of the souls of Christians derive all their strength and dignity, all the beauty of their holiness, from their union with Jesus Christ, of which union the Blessed Sacrament of his body and blood is the principal and most efficacious means, so the sacred character which belongs to the material building of God's house is derived wholly from that altar whereon this precious Sacrament is prepared. All the instruments employed in God's service become entitled to respect and reverence only in proportion to their proximity to this Holy of holies. It is this which makes Christian churches to be so holy, and which gives such exceeding dignity to the Christian priesthood: "for if under the old law," says St. Chrysostom, "great and noble things were said concerning the priests, and they were distinguished by many honours and privileges above ordinary men, how much more under the Gospel! The miracle which these perform exceeds the miracle of Elias; he called down fire from heaven, but these call down the Holy Spirit: and since they do this, since they perform the tremendous sacrifice, and continually handle the Lord and Maker of the world, tell me where shall we rank them? What purity, what holiness shall we require of them? Only consider what ought those hands to be which serve upon such things; what ought the tongue to be that utters such words; of what infinite purity and sanctity ought that soul to be which receives so great a Spirit. Whilst the priest is employed in this great mystery, angels surround him, and the whole army of the heavenly host cry aloud; and the place round about the altar is full of angels desirous to do honour

to Him who lies thereon. These things we must believe from a mere consideration of the nature of the Christian mysteries; but besides this, I once heard a man say, that an old man, a venerable man who was in the habit of seeing visions, told him that he had been vouchsafed an actual sight of these things; namely, that he had seen suddenly, at the time of the offering of the sacrifice, a great multitude of angels, as many as he could see, clothed in bright garments, and encircling the altar and bowing down their heads, as a man might see soldiers in the presence of their king.”*

But not only at the time of the offering of the sacrifice do angels wait about the consecrated altars of our churches; to holy monks and anchorites of old has been vouchsafed the sight of these ministering spirits attending upon our altars even at other times, and it has been revealed to them that from the moment of the altar’s consecration it was entrusted to their special guardianship.† And what wonder? for if the angels lingered about the empty sepulchre because honour was due to the place which had once, though but for a while, received the body of Christ, how much more venerable is a spot consecrated by the more frequent presence of that same body!

From the altar, then, the whole Church receives its sanctity; and the altar is holy, because although by nature it is a common stone, yet the body of Christ has been laid thereon, and thereby it has become sanctified. “This holy altar whereat we stand,” says St. Gregory Nyssen, “is by its own nature a common stone, differing in nothing from those other stones wherewith we build our walls and lay down our pavements; but because it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a solemn blessing, it is now a holy table, a spotless altar, and is no longer to be touched by all, but by the priests only, and by them with reverence.”‡ “What is the altar,” asks St. Optatus,§ “but the seat, or resting-place, of the body and blood of Christ? There his body and blood dwell for a certain time; there the vows of the people are offered, and the members of Christ; there the Almighty God is invoked, and the Holy Spirit is called upon and comes down; from thence many receive the pledge of eternal salvation, the defence of their faith, and the hope of their resurrection.” And he goes on to charge upon the Donatists their irreverent treatment of these consecrated altars, and also of the chalices; of these, he says that they had broken and sold them, and so consigned them to almost certain profanation, though they had borne

* De Sacerdot. vi. 4.

† De Baptismo Christi.

‡ Sophronii Pratum Spirituale, cc. 4, 10.

§ De Schism. Don. vi. 1.

within them the precious blood of Christ: of the altars he does not so much complain because they had scraped and planed their surface, as though they had been polluted by the holy sacrifice which the Catholic priests and bishops had offered thereon, but he complains that, not satisfied with this, they had even broken them in pieces, an act of violence which, if not absolutely necessary, was a very grievous sin of irreverence; and they had themselves shewn, he says, that they did not feel it to be absolutely necessary, since in so many instances they had been contented to do less.

But not the altar alone was an object of Christian reverence; every thing connected with it was also invested with a peculiar value and importance, and a certain degree of sacredness. "Veneration is due to the altar," says St. Jerome,* "to the chalices, to the coverings of the altar, and to the rest; they ought not to be treated as though they were like all other inanimate things, and void of every degree of sacredness, but in consequence of their close contact and union with the body and blood of Christ, they are to be treated with very great respect and reverence." Under the old dispensation, when Moses was about to finish the tabernacle, it was commanded him, "see that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shewn thee on the mount." The most nice and exact directions, from which he might not depart, were given concerning the form and material both of the altar and of every thing that concerned it; and so in the same way Christian bishops and councils have from the very earliest ages considered it their duty to pay very minute attention to similar particulars in the details of Christian worship. Only it is not with us as it was with the Jews, that an absolute type has been proposed, a standard from which we must never vary, so that one has only to look at the outward form to judge whether or no we have fulfilled what is required of us in this matter; but contrariwise, nothing outward is here of more value than another, excepting so far as it expresses greater inward devotion. Of course we are bound to spend the utmost care and magnificence we are able upon every thing connected with this Blessed Sacrament; yet since, after all, it must needs fall short of its real dignity, which is infinite, every thing must be judged of in relation to our condition and circumstances in life. If a man spend gold and silver upon his own person, his house and his furniture, and yet suffers the vessels used in the service of the altar to be of mean and unworthy materials, such a one cannot be very earnest in his devotion; whilst, on the other hand, every thing connected

* Ep. ad Theoph. 114.

with the outward service of God may be of the most humble and ordinary description, yet the faith and charity which offered it be most rare, and precious in his sight. We must remember the celebrated answer of St. Boniface, Bishop of Mentz and martyr in the eighth century, when asked whether vessels of wood might be used about this sacrament; "once," said he, "golden priests were wont to use chalices of wood; now, on the contrary, priests worthless as wood use chalices of gold."

Moreover there are uses for this world's wealth which the Church has always preferred even to the adorning of the altar and its furniture. St. Jerome commends St. Exuperius, Bishop of Tolosa, that he had sold the golden vessels of the Church for the sake of the poor; and adds, "yet nothing surely could exceed his wealth who carries the body of Christ, though it be but in a basket made of twigs, and in a vessel of glass." It is mentioned, too, in praise of St. Ambrose and St. Augustin,* that they in like manner had not hesitated to sell the sacred vessels when the necessities of the poor required it; and St. Chrysostom rebukes the folly of those who, behaving themselves with harshness and injustice towards widows and orphans, yet think that they do well, because they offer for the service of the Lord's table a chalice of gold set with precious stones. He reminds them that it was not a golden chalice, neither a table of silver, from which Christ Himself distributed the sacred species to his apostles; that curiously wrought pavements, lamps hung with silver chains, altar-coverings embroidered with gold, and all other such things, are very good and praiseworthy, but that almsgiving is still better; and that that is no true and genuine desire to do honour to Christ's body which clothes it with precious silks in this sacrament of the altar, but suffers it to go in cold and nakedness in the persons of the poor, his chosen representatives.

These instances, whilst they give us some insight into the piety of the early Church in devoting her worldly substance to the beautifying and enrichment of all that in any way concerned the worthy celebration of the great Christian sacrifice, shew us at the same time her admirable wisdom and prudence in the value which she taught her children to put upon all such outward circumstances. Accordingly we find both her laws and practice varying very considerably from time to time, and, indeed, in different countries also at the same time. At first, when Christians had the privilege of reserving the Blessed Sacrament in their own homes, they seem to have carried it

either in little vessels (which were generally wooden, but sometimes even of gold), or wrapt in linen cloths, or merely in their bare hands; and of course the vessels in which it was preserved in their houses varied according to the wealth and dignity of the possessor. When bishops, priests, or others carried it about with them during their travels, it seems to have been most commonly placed in a kind of scarf, or linen napkin, hung round the neck. Meanwhile, in the public service of the Church, vessels made of twigs (such as were used in some of the religious ceremonies of the heathen) appear to have been used by Christians also, and to have been retained, at least partially, until the fifth or sixth century; but these can only have been serviceable for the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament under one species, not both. Originally both the chalice and the paten were of wood or of glass, at least in ordinary circumstances; though doubtless, where they were able to afford it, they gladly availed themselves of one of the precious metals. We know from the story of St. Laurence, that gold and silver vessels were used in the Christian sacrifice in the middle of the third century, or at least that it was generally supposed so by their heathen emperors, and probably not without good reason;* and it is certain that before the end of this century they were so used; for when at a later period the chapel in the Catacombs was reopened, in which the Christians had been surprised during one of their assemblies at the tombs of SS. Chrysanthus and Daria, and were there buried alive by order of the Emperor Numerian, not only the mortal remains of the martyrs were brought to light, but also the silver vessels which they had been using when they were discovered. It is thought by some that Pope Zephyrinus at the end of the second century forbade the use of wood, and ordered the use of glass instead, because this could so much more easily be cleansed, and fragments more easily detected upon it and removed; others, however, are of opinion that he forbade the use even of vessels of glass, and ordered that they should be made of silver; or if he did not, Pope Urban, who succeeded to the chair of Peter only twenty years later, certainly did. Wooden chalices, however, were not wholly abandoned every where; for in the middle of the ninth century, Pope Leo IV. was obliged to renew the prohibition, as also of chalices of glass, or of any inferior metal; and even in the end of the twelfth century there was still occasion for Innocent III. to give a pound of silver to all those churches in Rome which were too poor to procure for themselves a chalice of that material. In our own country,

* See Prudent. Peristeph. Hymn. ii. 65.

a council in Northumberland, towards the latter part of the eighth century, forbade chalices and patens to be made of horn. Another council, held in London A.D. 1175, forbade the use of tin,* and required that they should be of gold or silver: so, too, the immediate successor of St. Thomas of Canterbury forbade a bishop to bless any that were made of tin, or other less precious materials; but in later times, when the country was in a measure impoverished by the large sum which had been paid for King Richard's ransom, a greater laxity was permitted; the principle being always the same, of not permitting the circumstances of God's service to be dishonoured by any avoidable meanness, yet, at the same time, of not laying upon the people a burden too heavy for them to bear.

But not only was the material of the sacred vessels thus variable from age to age; the shape and character of the vessels themselves were still more so. We have already said that when the Blessed Sacrament was reserved in private houses, it was usually in small vessels of wood, or, where circumstances permitted, even of gold; and these vessels appear to have been of an oblong shape, and provided, of course, with a cover to defend their precious contents from any accident; with a ring also in the top, that it might be suspended from the neck. From the beginning of the fourth century, however, when it was reserved in the public churches, it was commonly placed in a vessel made in the shape of a dove, as an emblem of the Holy Spirit, and this dove was suspended from the centre of the ciborium; not such as we now call the ciborium, but a lofty and substantial canopy, resting on two or four pillars, as it were itself a temple in miniature, serving to protect the altar which it covered from dust and all other inconveniences. Such canopies as these are still retained in the most ancient basilicas of Rome, St. John Lateran, St. Peter's, St. Mary Major's, St. Cecilia's, and others; and in the very ancient church of St. Clement in that city, the hook may still be seen from which this dove was originally hung; one of the doves themselves, too, is preserved in the sacristy of San Nazario in Milan. These doves were either of gold or silver, and were in some places, in Pisa for instance, suspended over the baptistery, as well as over the altar, for the greater facility of communicating the newly baptised. Sometimes they did not contain the Blessed Sacrament immediately, but only enclosed a pyx in which it was placed. They remained in common use in the Latin Church until the eleventh century. Sometimes, too, the pyx alone was suspended over the altar without the dove, as we read of the Emperor Henry having

* Labbe, Conc. xiii. p. 365, can. xvii.

given to a church a pyx of onyx stone, which was used in this way.* Six centuries earlier, however, there were introduced in Rome, and gradually throughout the Church, certain small towers, or tabernacles, not attached to the altar, but easily portable;† and these superseded in time the use of the dove, though at first they seem to have been intended to be used together. At least, St. Hilary,‡ who was Pope in the year 462, gave to the church of St. John intra Fontem, in Rome, both one of these towers in silver, weighing sixty pounds, and also a golden dove, weighing two pounds, as though the one had been made to rest upon, or perhaps within, the other; but to the church of San Lorenzo he gave a tower only: and Perpetuus, who was Bishop of Tours much about the same time, gave to Amalarius the priest a dove only; so that it would seem that at that time the dove and the tower were both used together, or either alone, quite indifferently. By and by, however, the dove was more generally dispensed with in churches where the towers were used, and the Blessed Sacrament was kept in the tower itself. Both the dove and the tower might have been seen in some of the French churches down to the close of the seventeenth century; the one in the diocese of Chartres, and the other in one of the churches of Tours. In the church of Santa Croce, at Rome, is retained even at the present day a custom yet more ancient than either of these, and probably it is the only instance where it yet lingers; the Blessed Sacrament is there reserved in a closed recess in the wall, at a considerable height from the ground, behind the altar, such as those in which the sacred oils are now wont to be kept in Catholic churches, but as the Holy Eucharist was once kept very commonly every where, more especially in Holland and Portugal. Indeed, it seems to have been the very earliest of all modes of reserving the sacred species; for in the (so-called) Apostolical Constitutions—a work to which cannot certainly be assigned a date later than the fourth century, and before that time the Blessed Sacrament could not have been reserved in churches at all—we read that when all had communicated, the deacons were to take up what remained and place it in the *pastophorium*, that is, as St. Jerome explains it,§ in the innermost part of the church, called also sometimes *thalamus*, because there was laid up the body of Christ, the true

* Hugo Flav. in Chron. Vindub. apud Nov. Bibl. MS. tom. i. p. 166, ed. Paris, 1577.

† St. Greg. Turon. de Gloria Martyrum, i. 86.

‡ Anastas. Bibl. apud Muratori Rer. Ital. Scrip. tom. iii. p. 120.

§ In Ezech. c. xl. The word is rendered in the Vulgate *gazophylacia*; and they were so called, because the priests and Levites kept there the sacred vessels belonging to the temple.

spouse of the Church and of our souls. Here the Blessed Sacrament was kept, and with it the sacred vessels also, under lock and key; and the name was retained even to the middle ages, even though the form may not have been identically the same. St. Charles Borromeo, however, ordered that this practice should be abolished wherever it still remained in his diocese;* and that these "*armoria*," as he calls them, should be put to other uses, such as the preservation of the holy oils.

The present form of tabernacles, attached to the altar, and forming as it were a part of it, appears to have become general in the thirteenth century, about the same time as the larger *ciboria* we have mentioned were disused, by which name therefore they were very often called, though more commonly perhaps by that of *custodiæ*; and the different provincial councils of the time abound therefore with rules and enactments concerning it. Among the constitutions of a council held at Oxford A.D. 1222, under Stephen Archbishop of Canterbury, it is ordered that the Holy Eucharist shall be kept in a clean pyx of silver or ivory, or some other fit and proper material; but nothing is said as to the place or manner of preserving this pyx. St. Edmund, his successor, repeated the same injunction; but in the constitutions published at Reading by another Archbishop of Canterbury in the same century, it was required of every parish church, that they should provide a decent and proper tabernacle, with lock and key, of quality proportioned to the ability of each church; and in this the Blessed Sacrament was to be reserved, not in a burse or small bag (the decree went on to say), because of the danger of breaking the particles, but in a handsome pyx, lined within with the whitest linen, so that it could both be taken out and replaced without risk. These tabernacles, however, were certainly not in universal use in this country even as late as the time of the Reformation; for amongst other wicked things which were done at that time in contempt and hatred of this adorable Sacrament, we read of one of the students of St. John's College, Cambridge, going into the chapel at night, and "secretly cutting the string whereby *the pyx hung above the altar*,"† being doubtless suspended from the centre of the hollow dome of the ciborium of which we have already spoken.

We have mentioned that it was ordered in the constitutions of Reading, that the pyx was to be lined with fine linen; this order was in strict accordance with the practice of the primitive Church, which always considered the use of linen about the Blessed Sacrament to be specially appropriate, as commemorative of those linen cloths in which the body of our Lord

* Acta Med. Eccl. tom. i. p. 386.

† Strype's Cranmer, i. 231.

was wrapped when it was laid in the sepulchre. St. Optatus bears testimony to the universal custom of covering the altars with such cloths, at least during the celebration of the sacrifice; and in the language of Christian symbolism, they were accounted emblematical of that tribulation which the sacred humanity of our Lord endured, and of the exceeding purity which is the fruit of tribulation;* and it was for this reason that they were preferred to the more costly material of silk, which yet was employed on less worthy objects. One of these pieces of linen, the corporal, being used only in immediate contact with the very body and blood of Christ during the sacrifice, was always held in great veneration, and provided with especial care. It is related of St. Clara during her long and painful illness, that she continually employed herself in working, as she lay in her bed, a great number of these corporals, which she put into silken cases or burses, and distributed to all the neighbouring churches; and it was enjoined by an ancient council of Rheims, that priests should exhort the women of their congregations to be forward in providing these necessary articles for the service of the altar. After they had been used, none might wash them but the priest only, or at most the deacon or sub-deacon (St. Charles Borromeo ordered that it should be done by the sub-deacon);† and they were to be washed in the church, or in the sacristy, or near the altar, in the same place where the sacred vessels were washed, that the water might be carefully thrown away: moreover, there were proper vessels to be provided, in which nothing but these and the coverings of the altar were to be washed;‡ and when they were old and worn out, in some churches it was ordered that they should be given to the dean, and by him to the bishop, that he might burn them; and the ashes were to be thrown into the baptistery or some other part of the church: and in our own country they were either burnt in the presence of the archdeacon, or they were laid up with the most sacred relics.

Moreover, these corporals were often made the instruments of miraculous deliverances, even as the Blessed Sacrament itself, especially from fire. In the ancient constitutions of Cluny, we read amongst the list of things that ought to be provided in the sacristy, that there should be one corporal always disengaged to lie on the left side of the altar, that so it might be at hand in case of fire, against which it is commonly believed (they say) that it is of great avail if it be spread out and held forth against the flames; just as when, in the fourth century, a fire broke out in Nola, which threatened to destroy the

* Rupert. Abb. Tuit. de Div. Off. ii. 23; Durand. Ration. Div. Off. i. 2, § 14.

† Act. Med. Eccl. tom. i. p. 326.

‡ Durand. Rat. Div. Off. i. 3, in fin.

church of St. Felix, St. Paulinus, who had built it, checked the progress of the flames by holding up a portion of the true cross: and as in the middle ages the *Agnus Dei** was often used in the same way, so too it was very usual to hold up the corporal, or even to throw it into the fire for the same purpose, and very frequently with the same success. It is true, indeed, that a provincial council in Germany, A.D. 1023,† condemned the practice as a rash presumption, prohibited it for the future, and severely censured the folly of those who had indulged it. Nevertheless, we have an authentic account of an instance of the kind at least a century later. A fire broke out in the month of September,‡ A.D. 1128, in the town of Tuitium. It soon reached the monastery; upon which one of the brothers ran and fetched a corporal from the sacristy, which he fastened to a long pole, and held towards the direction in which the fire was raging; this had no sensible effect, and he therefore thrust it into the fire, shaking it to and fro, until a portion of the staff was burnt, and the overpowering heat obliged him to withdraw. He found the corporal itself entirely uninjured; he therefore rolled it up and threw it into the flames, but it was presently caught by a strong wind, and borne back to a part of the house which the fire never reached, and where it was afterwards found with only a red mark on it, and no traces of burning at all. Whilst upon this subject, we may as well mention also the story told us by St. Gregory of Tours, of a fire which was immediately extinguished on his holding up towards it the golden pectoral cross which, like all Catholic bishops at the present day, he wore suspended from his neck, and which contained relics of our Blessed Lady, of the holy Apostles, and of St. Martin.

As our purpose in these pages is not to exhaust the subject with which we are engaged by enumerating every historical fact or every minute archæological detail which might properly be considered to belong to it, but only, as we said at the beginning, to lay before our readers in a popular form some of the most striking of those facts and details; we shall pass by much more that might be written about the respect that has ever been shewn to the altar and its furniture, and go on to speak a few words about the oblations that were made upon it. These two matters may very properly go together, since both stand in the same relation to the general subject of these

* "*Virtutem destruit ignis*" was part of the verses sent with an *Agnus Dei* to the Greek Emperor by Pope Urban V. A.D. 1362.

† Labbe, tom. xi. p. 1131, can. 6.

‡ Rupert. Abb. Tuit. de Incend. Opp. Tuit. c. 3, Op. tom. iv. p. 225, ed. Venet. 1749.

papers. Whatever degree of care and attention was bestowed, either upon the sacred vessels of the altar or upon the bread and wine that were offered in them; with whatever degree of respect or reverence these things may have been treated, it certainly was not on their own account that they were thus treated, but only on account of the relation in which they stood to the most holy Eucharist. The altar, the paten and chalice, the pyx, ciborium, and tabernacle, the corporal and burse,—these things engaged the attention of the Church, and formed the subjects of episcopal inquiry and of the decrees of councils, because they were to be the repository, for a longer or shorter time, of the body and blood of Christ in the most holy sacrament; and so, in the same way, it could not be a matter of indifference to the Church what oblations were made upon the altar, and by whom, seeing that out of those oblations was to be chosen a certain portion which, by the words of consecration, should itself become that body and that blood.

In the various accounts of the Last Supper which have been recorded by the evangelists, bread and wine are the only elements expressly mentioned; nevertheless, it has been an unvarying rule in the Church, from the very times of the apostles, always to mix a little water with the wine; and all the fathers insist upon it as absolutely necessary, according to the example and commandment of Christ himself. They assign also mystical reasons for it; some, indeed, speak of it as having been done in commemoration of the blood mingled with water which flowed from the Saviour's side as He hung upon the Cross; but it is more commonly explained as denoting the intimate union which must exist between Christ, denoted by the wine, and ourselves, the people, who are represented in Holy Scripture under the figure of water;* and for this reason too it is required that there should be but *little* water, "that the majesty of the blood of Jesus Christ may be far more abundant than the weakness of the people."† Others, again, have understood this mixture of water with the wine as typical of the union of the two natures in Christ—his divinity and humanity. The Armenians, who denied this union, mixed no water with the wine, and justified the omission by a mistaken interpretation of one of St. Chrysostom's homilies. Others, through an affectation of greater austerity, used water only, and were therefore called *aquarii*; whilst others offered hosts made of bread mixed with cheese, because they had a conceit that the offering should be made from the

* Apoc. xvii. 15.

† See St. Cyprian, Ep. 63 ad Cæcil.; Conc. Tribur. can. 19.

fruits of the animal as well as of the vegetable world, thus uniting in one the offerings both of Cain and Abel, the first-fruits of the flocks and of the ground; and these were called *artotyritæ*. For a similar reason, some heretics, even as late as the seventh century, offered milk instead of wine. The Cataphryges, with a yet more strange and wilful superstition, mixed the flour of which they made the hosts with the blood of an infant only a year old, from whose body they drew it by innumerable punctures, which if the child survived, he was accounted a great priest, but if he died, a martyr; and others had other still more degrading rites, too horrible to be mentioned.

Among the Greeks and other churches of the East, it is an ancient custom not only to mix water with the wine before consecration, but also to pour into the chalice after consecration and before communion a small portion of warm water, which they say is intended to typify the fervour of faith* wherewith they ought to be influenced who approach so great a mystery. The Church of Rome has never prohibited this practice;† it has been allowed to the Greeks even in Rome itself—as by Innocent IV., A. D. 1254; nevertheless it has been sometimes condemned in provincial councils as an unwarranted deviation from the general practice of the Church. Another variety in the practice of the Eastern and Western Churches has not been continued with so little prejudice to Christian peace and charity; we mean in the use of leavened or unleavened bread. The Greeks not only consecrated unleavened bread themselves—by which they intended to denote the soul of Christ, against the heresy of Apollinarius—but were so jealous in behalf of their own peculiarity in this respect as to denounce very angrily any difference of practice; they also mixed a little salt with it, as typical of the mind or reason of Christ, and they complained of the hosts of the Latins as dead, without mind or soul, with nothing of life.‡ Moreover, they only consecrated, for the purpose of reserving it for the sick, once in the year, namely, on Maundy-Thursday, when they beat the hosts in order to compress and harden them as much as possible, mixed a little blest oil with them, or sometimes even poured some of the sacred blood upon them, and then rebaked or otherwise dried them. But this was forbidden by Innocent IV. in a letter to the Greek Archbishop of Cyprus, wherein he required them to consecrate afresh at least every fortnight; and that injunction was repeated by Clement VIII

* Combes, Auct. Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 437, in not.

† Bull. Ben. XIV. tom. ix.

‡ Isaac Armen. Cath. Amb. Invect. apud Combes, ubi supra.

at the end of the sixteenth century; but neither of these Popes interfered with the use of leavened bread, though the Latins had always observed the contrary rule, and so also had the Maronites and Armenians.* Mabillon appears to prove this very satisfactorily even from the earliest ages; and it certainly would seem to have been the apostolic practice; for although it is true that leaven may be occasionally used in the parables of our Lord as a figure of what is good, and not uniformly, as has been sometimes said, to typify evil, still, whereas the language of St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians seems natural and intelligible supposing them to have used unleavened bread for the Holy Eucharist, it would certainly be very much otherwise on the contrary supposition. "Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste; as you are unleavened; for Christ, our Pasch, is sacrificed. Therefore, let us feast, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

This is a controversy, however, upon which we need not enter; it is more to our present purpose to observe, that it was the custom of the primitive Christians to offer, and very often even to prepare, their own bread for consecration in this holy Sacrament. This was done by the high and noble, as well as by the more humble, and was esteemed a sacred privilege of which those who had not the right of communicating were unworthy. But of those who were admitted to a full participation in the mysteries, none was excepted from the duty of making oblations; and many, as we have said, even of the highest rank prepared and baked the bread for this purpose themselves. This is recorded of the Emperor Valens, for instance; also of Candida,† the wife of Trajan, general-in-chief of the army of the Emperor Valerius in the beginning of the fifth century, of whom it is told that she used to stay up all night before going to holy communion, to grind the corn and bake the bread which she was to offer the following morning. Some persons of rank used to send their oblations by the hands of their servants; but whether by themselves or by others, the practice itself continued to be of universal obligation for six or seven centuries; not but that it was often necessary, more especially towards the latter portion of that period, to put the faithful in mind of this obligation, and sharply to rebuke many for their disregard of it; thus a pro-

* Van Espen. *Jus Eccles. Univers.* pars ii. tit. iv. c. 1, § 6.

† Palladius *Hist. Lausac.* c. 79.

vincial council, held A.D. 585,* strictly enjoins that both men and women should bring the oblations of bread and wine at least every Sunday. The practice seems to have fallen into general disuse somewhere about the eighth century; yet it was not wholly discontinued, for Pope Nicholas I., in the middle of the ninth, made it a subject of complaint that many came to communion and partook of the offerings made by others, to which they had not themselves contributed.

These oblations were made for the dead as well as for the living; for since both the one and the other were still bound together in one living body, the Church, it was not right that when men passed away from the visible scene of this world, their memories should also perish in the Church. Moreover it was accounted a positive benefit to the departed, and a means of obtaining some degree of mercy and favour towards them, that these oblations should be still continued; it gave them a special interest in the sacrifice whereat those oblations were made, and in the prayers of the whole Church.† “For we ought to assist the dead as far as possible,” says St. Chrysostom,‡ “not by tears, but by prayers and supplications, by almsgivings and oblations; for it is through no idle and foolish device that we commemorate the departed in the divine mysteries, and draw near and implore in their behalf the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world, who is there set before us, but in order that they may thereby derive some consolation; neither is it in vain that the priest, standing at the altar and performing those awful mysteries, cries aloud, bidding us pray for all who sleep in Christ; for if there were no commemoration made of them, these words would not be used; for ours are no vain and empty performance, as at a theatre,—God forbid!—but every thing is ordered by the Holy Spirit himself. It may be, then, that we shall obtain pardon for the departed either through our prayers, or through the gifts that are offered for them, or through those martyrs, confessors, and priests, whose names are enumerated with them.”

But since these gifts were offered for the dead as well as for the living, and since of course the dead could not receive them again when consecrated, there came from the very first to be a double, or even triple, division of the gifts presented in this manner. Only a portion of them was consecrated to be the body and blood of Christ, and so distributed to the communicants; the rest was either merely blest and given to others of the faithful who did not communicate, or it was

* Conc. Matiscon. ii. can. iv.; Labbe, tom. vi. p. 674.

† St. Aug. Enchiridion, c. 110.

‡ In Epist. 1 ad Cor. Hom. xli.

reserved for the use of the poor and of the clergy. The custom of blessing some of the bread, which was then called *eulogiæ*, and giving it to non-communicants, was, as we have already seen, very ancient; its use continued in England up to the time of the Reformation, and it still remains, both in many churches of France, and generally among the Greeks* and Armenians. The priest prays God† to bless it with his holy and spiritual benediction, that it may be for the well-being both of body and mind to all those who receive it, and for a defence against all diseases, and against every evil device of all their enemies. It is distributed as soon as Mass is ended, the recipients kneeling and kissing the priest's hand, and then consuming it with reverence, not only as a token of communion and fellowship, but also as having received a blessing, as well from the prayer of the priest as from its proximity to the body and blood of Christ.‡ It was forbidden, however, by the Council of Laodicea, and in more modern times by the Bishop of Angers, A.D. 1263, to distribute them at Easter (and this prohibition is still observed in the diocese of Besançon), lest the common people should ignorantly confound them with the Blessed Sacrament itself. The same prohibition was extended in the East to the whole of Lent, excepting on Saturday and Sunday, probably in order that the fast might not be broken.§

The bread that was used for this purpose, and also for the communion of the faithful, was collected in the middle of Mass after the creed had been sung; another collection of offerings from the people was made before the Gospel,—viz. of all that was intended for the service of the clergy, or for the poor, or for the general use of the church; such as ordinary bread, wine, wax, incense, cloths for the altar, &c. The priest or bishop who was officiating came down from the altar, whilst the choir was chanting the offertory (as they did even in St. Augustin's time), and collected the bread and such other oblations as could be put into a large napkin, carried by two acolytes. The archdeacon (or, if a priest only was officiating, the deacon) followed, and received all the little vessels of wine and emptied them into the chalice, which was borne by the subdeacon, and he again emptied it into a still larger vessel, carried by an acolyte.|| When all had been collected, the deacon poured out from the wine which had been offered enough for the present occasion, carefully straining it as he did so, lest any of the nu-

* Allatius de Consensu Perpet. Eccl. Occ. et Ori. lib. iii. c. 15. § 3.

† See the collect in Van Espen, Jus Eccl. Univ. pars iii. tit. 5. c. 4.

‡ Bellotte de Rit. Eccl. Laud. p. 634.

§ Baronius Annal. ad A.D. 313. tom. iii. p. 103.

|| The large gilt vessels in which the wine was thus formerly collected are still placed on the credence-table when the Pope says High Mass.

merous contributions thus brought together should have chanced to contain any impurity; and the rest was reserved for other uses. The inconveniences, however, of this arrangement, especially in large and crowded churches, soon obliged them to direct that all which was destined for the clergy or for the poor should be taken to the bishop's house, and not carried into the church at all: then, in the eighth century, the material offerings of bread and wine were gradually exchanged for the more portable offering of money, which, however, did not wholly supersede the more ancient practice until the twelfth or thirteenth century. Indeed, even St. Charles Borromeo* found the primitive custom still surviving in some parts of his diocese, and he sought to revive it in others; and even at the present day, the stranger who assists at a solemn High Mass in the magnificent Duomo of Milan will see (among other peculiarities belonging to the Ambrosian rite) a procession of ten old men followed by as many women, all clothed in a particular dress suitable to the purpose, come up to the doors of the sanctuary at the time of the offertory, and the two foremost of either sex present to the deacon, one of them three hosts, and the other a cruet of wine, to be used in the sacrifice then about to be offered. This little confraternity is called the School of St. Ambrose, and consists of poor bedesmen supported by the alms of the cathedral; and they make the offering in the name of the people generally. In some parts of France also, it is customary at all masses for the dead, for the nearest relative of the deceased to make an offering (immediately after the *Credo*) of a small loaf, a taper, and a piece of money. The kings of France used to make a similar offering during the mass that was said at their consecration. Some traces of the ancient offertory remain also in the masses for the ordination of priests and the consecration of bishops; but as a general practice it has ceased to exist.

The offering of money very naturally and immediately led to the present practice of private Masses for the intention of particular individuals, since it had been always held that the merits of the Sacrifice specially appertained to those who had made the oblations for it, or at least to them more than to others; and these merits could now be appropriated to one only, by means of the priest refusing to receive the oblations of any other at that Mass; which would not have been possible, or at least not easy, whilst they continued to bring the bread and wine in kind. Some persons, therefore, had a strong prejudice against this new practice, as tending unduly to limit and interfere with the pre-eminently social, and even

* Acta Med. Eccl. tom. i. p. 326.

universal, intercessory character of the Christian Sacrifice. Before now, they said, St. Chrysostom and other ancient doctors always spoke of the community of prayers as one essential characteristic of the Mass; the priest praying for the people; the people praying with and for the priest; both priest and people praying for demoniacs, for penitents, for catechumens, for the sick, the dying, and the dead; for those who travel by land or by sea; for the fruits of the whole earth; in a word, for all sorts and conditions of men, and for all blessings, spiritual and temporal: this, they said, was the great feature of Christian worship. But now they complained that this spirit of universal benevolence would be checked and thwarted, if the benefits of the great Christian Sacrifice were to be confined to some one or more individuals, who happened to have provided the offering for that purpose. This, however, was, to say the least, a very exaggerated fear; since the words of the Mass remained precisely the same as before: so that priests were still obliged to pray, whether they would or not, for the whole Catholic Church and its rulers; for all its members, whether living or dead, and particularly for those who were personally present assisting: the only difference being that, whereas they had been hitherto bound to pray and to offer the Sacrifice in a yet more special and peculiar manner for those who had given the oblations on that day, now this benefit was confined to one individual at a time. However, it is curious to observe that a law was made in the reign of King Ethelred, that is, at the beginning of the eleventh century,* that one Mass should be said daily in every church throughout the country for the king and for the whole people, exclusively of all private individuals whatever; and that every religious who was a priest should say Mass at least thirty times in a year for the same intention.

In the middle of the tenth century, another natural substitute for more ancient oblations became common, in the shape of legacies or donations of vineyards, and other property, to supply bread and wine for the service of God's altar. This use is generally specified in deeds of this kind prior to any other,† though the support of the clergy, the relief of the poor, and other necessities of the Church are mentioned afterwards; and all this was done, it is declared, "for the forgiveness of his own sins, as well as of those of all others with whom he had to do." This was, in fact, only another and a surer way of providing for the perpetual offering of those oblations which, in

* Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Disc. circ. Benef. tom. iii. lib. i. c. 71, 72.*

† Thomassin, *ubi supra.*

the primitive Church, were wont to be made by the surviving friends of the deceased.

Whilst the oblations still continued to be made by all Christians indiscriminately, it belonged to them also, as we have seen, to prepare them; and this they did, for the most part, with their own hands; for it was not lawful to use portions of common bread not made expressly for the purpose. One of the canons of the Council of Toledo, at the end of the seventh century, condemns certain Spanish priests* for not using proper hosts, but only portions of their own ordinary loaves, moulded into a round shape; and requires that they must be something whole, pure, prepared with great care, and of a moderate size, neither too large nor too small. A council in our own country, held in some part of Northumberland† a century later, made a similar rule; and the fifth Council of Arles,‡ 230 years before, ordered that all oblations should be made after a particular fashion then in use in that city. Even in St. Gregory's time the hosts were always round,§ and, as we learn from a story told by Venerable Bede,|| of a remarkable whiteness; but they were much larger then than those which are now in use; for in some places they only reserved one for the communion of the sick, from which they broke off a bit whenever it was wanted. In the monastery of Cluny they reserved four for this purpose; indeed, they only consecrated three every day, and five on Sundays, which being divided, were sufficient for the whole congregation; and generally it was a limited number only that was consecrated, that number being determined by some mystical meaning, which varied on the different festivals. Thus, in the Spanish Church in the ninth century, they offered only one on ordinary days, and five, arranged in the shape of a cross, on Sundays. At Christmas, and on the festivals of the Ascension and Transfiguration, they offered twelve hosts, arranged round a centre, which represented the Son of God; the inner circle of four represented the four Evangelists, and the outer circle of seven was to represent the "seven angels who stand before the Lord" (Job xii. 15.) Even at Easter and Whitsuntide they only offered forty-five, arranged in different shapes, with some secret and mysterious interpretation. It is clear, therefore, that they must have been much larger than those to which we are now accustomed, and that each person did not receive an entire host. About the twelfth century, the hosts were made in an iron mould, of the shape and size of a denarius; on one

* Can. vi. tom. viii. p. 62.

† Can. i. tom. vi. p. 460

|| Hist. Eccl. Angl. ii. 5.

† Conc. Chalcutense, can. x. tom. viii. p. 635.

§ Durant. de Rit. Eccl. lib. ii. c. 38.

side of which were the letters Alpha and Omega, with a cross between them: and on the other side was an image of Christ, and the sacred monogram XPC.; and the iron instrument used for this purpose is reckoned by the writers of that day amongst the articles which every priest ought to have.* The Greeks used no instrument, but moulded it with the hand; making it either round, a shape emblematical of infinity, and therefore of the Godhead; or more frequently into the four branches of a cross, emblematical of the four quarters of the world, to which salvation was offered through this Victim, who suffered on the cross; and therefore they stamped a cross both in the middle and also in the ends of these branches.† Now, however, they make their hosts either square or round; but in either case a cross is stamped in the centre, and letters in each corner: intended to declare Christ's victory over sin and Satan, and, by consequence, our victory also, through our union with Him, wrought in this Sacrament. The Alexandrines and Copts used round hosts, stamped with many crosses (the Syrians always had twelve), and round the edge of the host were the words, "Holy and strong."

All these particulars, even those of which we are unable to discover the *rationale*, no less than those whose meaning is obvious, mark very plainly the religious care with which Christians of all nations have always watched over every particular which could in any way contribute to the solemnity and reverence worthy of all that concerns so great a Sacrament. This is still more remarkable, perhaps, in the rules which prescribed the manner in which these hosts should be prepared. When it was no longer done by each Christian for himself, it was ordered that it should be done by the priests and deacons, or at least only in their presence. They were to collect the wheat or the meal from house to house among the faithful, as the Greeks still do; and if they received wheat, the grains were to be carefully picked over, that no faulty one might be used; then it was to be kneaded in the sacristy, the clergy being robed in their albs and stoles (surplices only are mentioned in the constitutions of the Bishop of Lincoln in the thirteenth century), and either reciting certain psalms and hymns, or, like the monks of Cluny, engaged in silent meditation. Moreover, it was required that they should be fasting when they did this;‡ and these religious practices continued in the Latin Church, certainly in all religious houses, and not uncommonly among the secular clergy also, down to the fif-

* Dacher. *Spicileg.* i. 694; iii. 471.

† Arcudius de *Concord. utriusq. Eccl.* iii. c. 38.

‡ Martene de *Ant. Mon. Rit.* ii. c. 8.

teenth century. One of the provincial synods held by St. Charles Borromeo, ordered that the altar-breads, or *offletes* or *obleys* (*oblata*), as they were called by our forefathers in this island, should be always made by a cleric; and those priests who trusted the performance of this work to the mere mercenary labour of others, were severely reprovèd for their lack of reverence. Neither was this watchful carefulness confined to the Catholic Church; heretics and schismatics too had their own peculiar customs of the same kind. The Greeks assigned the duty to laymen, but to laymen chosen for the purpose; the Russians to the widows of priests. Cyril, the Jacobite Patriarch of Alexandria in the eleventh century, forbade women either to prepare or bake the hosts. But no custom is more curious, perhaps, than that which is observed by the Nestorian priest even at the present day: he rises at midnight, and when he has recited twenty psalms or more, he takes a handful of meal, which he mixes with some leaven that has been previously blessed, also with a little salt, oil, and three drops of water; next he takes the thurible, and having made a small cake, which he places in it, he holds it in this manner over a chafing-dish, that it may be baked; meanwhile he repeats a certain prayer, and stamps it with the Cross; then he makes another cake in the same way, which he places on the right side of the first, saying, "At his right hand was crucified he who believed;" and so, in like manner, another at the left, saying, "At his left hand was crucified he who refused to believe." This was probably at first, whatever it may now have become, no idle senseless superstition, but was intended to remind the priests who had to prepare and to administer, and so frequently themselves also to receive, this Holy Sacrament, of the awful yet most certain truth, that as our Lord, when He was upon earth in human flesh, was a savour of life unto life to some, but of death unto death to others, even so is it now in this life-giving mystery of the Holy Eucharist: to some it is a pledge and a means of everlasting salvation; whilst others, who eat and drink unworthily, eat and drink judgment to themselves, not discerning the body of the Lord. Such, at any rate, are the reflections which the ceremony we have described is calculated to suggest, and we have little doubt but that such was its original meaning: it brings most forcibly to the mind those words of the Catholic hymn:

Sumunt boni, sumunt mali,
Sorte tamen inæquali
Vitæ vel interitûs.

Mors est malis, vita bonis;
Vide paris sumptionis
Quam sit dispar exitus.

It is not strange, therefore, that heresy in our own country did not descend all at once from that careful scrupulosity which had ever before characterised all ancient usage with reference to the choice of bread for the Holy Eucharist, to that scandalous carelessness and indifference upon the matter which is now so manifest. It was one of the injunctions issued by Queen Elizabeth, in her capacity as head of the Church, that "the sacramental bread should be made plain, without any figure thereupon, but of the same fineness and fashion, round, though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness, as the usual bread and wafer heretofore used in private Masses." At a later period, however, we find a rubric in the Book of Common Prayer, which declares that "to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." But the descendants of these *Reformers* have carried their reformation so much further, as that, in some places, where "the best and purest wheat bread" cannot "conveniently be gotten," they have not hesitated to substitute for it the fruit of the cocoa, and for the wine the intoxicating liquor extracted from that fruit, or still more frequently the fruit of the bread-tree.*

MIRACLES.—FATHER NEWMAN AND THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

A CORRESPONDENCE was not long ago made public in the newspapers, which furnishes a pregnant illustration of the remarks in a subsequent article in our present Number. In some respects, indeed, the non-Catholic portion of the correspondence we allude to is strikingly in contrast with the ordinary proceedings of the "Protestant criticising." Dr. Hinds, the Bishop of Norwich, in his temper, his intention to be fair, and his warm-hearted recognition of the ties of old friendship, stands out in most welcome contrast with the average run of anti-Catholic controversialists, and specially of many of the Puseyite school. His letters to Father Newman, first published in the *Morning Chronicle* newspaper of October the 21st last, are perhaps the only episcopal letters, which have for some time appeared, of which the writer need not feel ashamed, and which have added

* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, September 1841; Dublin Review, vol. iv. p. 393.

to, rather than diminished, the reputation he previously enjoyed. Apart, moreover, from the amiable and candid tone of Dr. Hinds' letters, the whole correspondence brings out so fully the question which has for some time been agitated by journalists and their correspondents, that we think our readers will not be sorry to have it reprinted in our own pages with a view to its preservation. We therefore quote it at length, by way of introduction to the remarks we have to make on Dr. Hinds' concluding letter, and the illustration it supplies of the extraordinary difficulty of getting the Protestant intellect to grasp the first elements of Catholic controversy which meets us on every side.

NO. 1. DR. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

Thurles, Ireland, October 2.

MY DEAR LORD,—A slip of a Norwich paper has been sent me, which purports to give a speech of the "Bishop of the diocese," delivered in St. Andrew's Hall, at a meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Though the name of the diocese is not stated, I cannot be mistaken, under these circumstances, in ascribing the speech to your Lordship. Yet I know not how to credit that certain words contained in it, which evidently refer to me, should have been uttered by one so liberal, so fair, and temperate in his general judgments, as your Lordship.

The words are these: "My friends, I have heard,—and I am sure all of you who have heard of it will share with me in the disgust as well as the surprise with which I have heard of it,—that there is a publication circulated through this land, the stronghold of Bible Christianity—a publication issuing from that Church against which we are protesting, and which is, on the other hand, the stronghold of human authority—a publication issuing from one of the most learned of its members, a man who, by his zeal as a convert, and by his position and acceptance with that Church, speaks with the authority of the Church itself, and represents its doctrines and feelings—a publication, as I have heard with dismay, read, admired, circulated, which maintains that the legendary stories of those puerile miracles, which I believe until now few Protestants thought that the Roman Catholics themselves believed—that these legends *have a claim to belief equally* with that word of God which relates the miracles of our God as recorded in the Gospel, and that *the authority of the one is as the authority of the other, the credibility of the one based on a foundation no less sure than the credibility of the other.*"

The statements here animadverted on are as contrary to

the teaching of the Catholic Church as they can be repugnant to your own views of Christian truth.

Should I be right in supposing that you did not really impute them to me, I beg to apologise to you for putting you to the trouble of disavowing the newspaper account. But if, contrary to my expectation, you acknowledge them to be yours, I take the liberty of begging your Lordship to refer me to the place in any work of mine in which they are contained.

You will not, I am sure, be surprised if, at a moment like the present, when so many misrepresentations are made of Catholicism and its defenders, I should propose, as I do, to give the same publicity to any answer you shall favour me with, as has been given to the speech, the report of which has occasioned my question.

I am, my dear Lord, yours very faithfully,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

NO. 2. THE BISHOP OF NORWICH TO DR. NEWMAN.

London, October 8.

MY DEAR NEWMAN,—As I have already replied to an inquiry the same as that which you make, in a letter to the Rev. W. Cobb, Roman Catholic priest in Norwich, I enclose a copy of that letter.

If I have misrepresented you, you will, I hope, believe me when I say that it has been from misunderstanding you. Permit me to add, that what has misled me is likely, you may be sure, to mislead others. I shall rejoice, therefore, at any public statement from you which may disabuse your readers of false impressions. When you are found to be maintaining (as you appear to do) that the miracles of the apostolic age were only the beginning of a like miraculous development to be manifested and accredited through succeeding times, and professing your belief in the facts of this further miraculous development in terms as solemn as those of a creed, it is very difficult to avoid the impression that the scriptural narratives are to be regarded as the beginning only of a series of the like histories, partaking of their credibility and authority, although the one may be called Scripture, and the other legend.

Time and circumstances have so long divided us, that I ought to apologise for the familiar mode in which I have addressed you; but your handwriting has brought back to my mind other days and some dear friends, who were then friends and associates of both of us, and I would still desire you to believe me very truly yours,

S. NORWICH.

No. 3 (*enclosed in No. 2*). THE BISHOP OF NORWICH TO
MR. COBB.

Athenæum, London, October 6.

REV. SIR,—My absence from home when your letter was delivered, and my not having Dr. Newman's publications by me when I received it here, have caused a delay in my making reply to your inquiry. The work to which I alluded, when I stated in St. Andrew's Hall that he asserted for certain legendary accounts of miracles the same credibility which is claimed for the scriptural narratives and statements of miracles, is his *Lectures on Catholicism in England*, more particularly lecture vii. p. 298. In this passage, after discriminating between some legends and others, as we discriminate between genuine Scripture and that which is either spurious or doubtful, he professes his faith in those the authority of which he pronounces to be unquestionable, in terms such as these:

"I think it impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. . . . I firmly believe that saints in their lifetimes have before now raised the dead to life, crossed the sea without vessels, multiplied grain and bread, cured incurable diseases, and stopped the operation of the laws of the universe in a multitude of ways. Many men, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncrasy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. They have a right to say so, if they will; *and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the mystery of mysteries, the Divine Incarnation.*"

He pursues the same view in his volume of *Discourses for Mixed Congregations*, setting aside as a thing of naught the essential difference between the claim which Scripture has on our belief in miracles related there, and that of human legends for the like statements, and recognising no difference but that of the marvellousness of the things related in the one or in the other.

"They," speaking of Protestants, "have not in them the principle of faith; and, I repeat it, it is nothing to the purpose to urge that at least they firmly believe Scripture to be the word of God. In truth, it is much to be feared that their acceptance of Scripture itself is nothing better than a prejudice or inveterate feeling impressed on them when they were children. A proof of this is, that while they profess to

be so shocked at Catholic miracles, and are not slow to call them 'lying wonders,' *they have no difficulty at all about Scripture narratives, which are quite as difficult to the reason as any miracles recorded in the history of the saints.* I have heard, on the contrary, of Catholics who have been startled at first reading in Scripture the narrative of the ark in the deluge, of the tower of Babel, of Balaam and Balak, of the Israelites' flight from Egypt and entrance into the promised land, and of Esau's and Saul's rejection; which the bulk of Protestants receive without any effort of mind."—P. 217.

In his speech at the Birmingham meeting he propounded the same view in reference to God's revelation through nature, as he has in the preceding passages in reference to God's written word. He said on that occasion, if his words are rightly reported, "We have no higher proof of the doctrines of natural religion—such as the being of a God, a rule of right and wrong, and the like—than we have of the Romish system;" including, I must presume, all those legendary statements which he so strongly represents as a part of that system.

It would be very satisfactory to me to have any authoritative disclaimer of these publications as exponents of your Church's views; for they alarm me, from their tendency to bring into discredit that faith which, notwithstanding the serious differences that unhappily divide us, we still, God be thanked, hold in common and cherish in common.

I ought to add, that in giving those last words which you have quoted from the newspapers, the reporters must have heard me imperfectly, or have misapprehended me. I did not say that Dr. Newman asserted for the miracles related in the Romish legends a credibility based upon the foundation of divine revelation, no less than those of Scripture. What I said was, that he claimed for the miracles related in the legends, the authorship of which was human, the same amount of credibility as for the miracles and divine revelations recorded in Scripture, the authorship of which was divine; thus leading his readers either to raise the authority of the legends to that of Scripture, or to bring down the authority of Scripture to that of the legends, the latter of which appeared to me to be the more likely result.

I am, Rev. Sir, your faithful servant, S. NORWICH.

NO. 4. DR. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

Oratory, Birmingham, Oct. 11.

MY DEAR LORD,—I thank you for the kind tone of your letter, which it was very pleasant to me to find so like that

of former times, and for the copy you enclose of your answer to Mr. Cobb.

Your Lordship's words, as reported in the Norwich paper, were to the effect that I believed the ecclesiastical miracles to have "a claim to belief *equally* with that word of God which relates the miracles of our God, as recorded in the Gospels;" that I made "the authority of the one as the authority of the other," and "the credibility of the one as based on a foundation no less sure than the credibility of the other."

You explain this in a letter to Mr. Cobb thus:—"I did not say that Dr. Newman asserted for the miracles related in the Romish legends a credibility based upon the foundation of divine revelation, no less than those of Scripture. What I said was, that he claimed for the miracles related in the legends, the authorship of which was human, the same amount of *credibility* as for the miracles and divine revelations recorded in Scripture, the authorship of which was divine."

Will you allow me to ask you the meaning of your word "credibility?" for it seems to me a fallacy is involved in it. Archbishop Whately says that controversies are often verbal. I cannot help being quite sure that your Lordship's difficulty is of this nature.

When you speak of a miracle being *credible*, you must mean one of two things: either that it is "antecedently probable," or *verisimile*; or that it is "furnished with sufficient evidence," or *provable*. In which of these senses do you use the word? If you describe me as saying that the ecclesiastical miracles come to us on the same *evidence* as those of Scripture, you attribute to me what I have never dreamt of asserting. If you understand me to say that the ecclesiastical miracles are on the same level of *antecedent probability* with those of Scripture, you do justice to my meaning; but I do not conceive it is one to raise "disgust."

I am not inventing a distinction for the occasion; it is found in Archbishop Whately's works; and I have pursued it at great length in my *University Sermons*, and in my *Essay on Miracles*, published in 1843, which has never been answered, as far as I know, and a copy of which I shall beg to present to your Lordship.

First, let us suppose you to mean by "credible," antecedently probable, or *likely* (*verisimile*); and you will then accuse me of saying that the ecclesiastical miracles are as *likely* as those of Scripture. What is there extreme or disgusting in such a statement, whether you agree with it or not? I certainly *do* think that the ecclesiastical miracles *are* as credible, in this sense, as the Scripture miracles; nay, more so,

because they come after Scripture; and Scripture breaks, (as it were) the ice. The miracles of Scripture begin a new law; they innovate on an established order. There is less to surprise in a second miracle than in a first. I do not see how it can be denied that ecclesiastical miracles, as coming *after* Scripture miracles, have not to bear the brunt of that antecedent improbability which attaches, as Hume objects, to the idea of a violation of nature. Ecclesiastical miracles are *probable*, because Scripture miracles are *true*. This is all I have said or implied in the two passages you have quoted from me, as is evident from both text and context.

As to the former of the two, I there say, that if Protestants are surprised at my having no *difficulty* in believing ecclesiastical miracles, I have a right to ask them why they have no difficulty in believing the Incarnation. Protestants find a difficulty in even listening to evidence adduced for ecclesiastical miracles. I have none. Why? Because the admitted fact of the Scripture miracles has taken away whatever *primâ facie* unlikelihood attaches to them as a violation of the laws of nature. My whole lecture is on the one idea of "assumed principles," or antecedent judgments or theories; it has nothing to do with proof or evidence. And so of the second passage. I have but said that Protestants "have no *difficulty* at all about Scripture miracles, which are quite as difficult to *reason* as any miracle recorded in the history of the saints." Now, I really cannot conceive a thoughtful person denying that the history of the ark at the deluge is as difficult to reason as a saint floating on his cloak. As to the third passage you quote as mine, about "revelation through nature," and the "Romish system," and the "legendary statements," I know nothing about it. I cannot even guess of what words of mine it is the distortion. Tell me the when and where, and I will try to make out what I really said. If it professes to come from my recent lectures, all I can say is, that what I spoke, I read from a printed copy; and what I printed, I published; and what is not in the printed volume, I did not say.

But now for the second sense of the word "credible." Do you understand me to say that the ecclesiastical miracles come to us on as good *proof* or *grounds* as those of Scripture? If so, I answer distinctly, I have said no such thing any where. The Scripture miracles are credible, *i. e.* provable, on a ground peculiar to themselves—on the authority of God's word. Observe my expressions:—I think it "*impossible to withstand the evidence* which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius." Should I thus speak of the resurrection of Lazarus?—should I say, "I think it impossible

to *withstand the evidence* for his resurrection?" I cannot tell how Protestants would speak, but a Catholic would say, "I believe it with a certainty beyond all other certainty; *for* God has spoken." Moreover, I believe with a like certainty every one of the Scripture miracles; not only that Apostles and Prophets "in their lifetime have *before now* raised the dead to life," &c., but that Elias did this, and St. Peter did that, and just as related; and so all through the whole catalogue of their miracles. On the other hand, ecclesiastical miracles may be believed, one more than another; and more or less by different persons. This I have expressed in words which occur in the passage from which you quote; for after saying of one, "I think it *impossible to withstand the evidence* for" it, I say of another extraordinary fact no more than, "I see *no reason to doubt*" it; and of a third still less, "*I do not see why it may not*" be; whereas, whatever God has said is to be believed absolutely and by all. This applies to the account of the ark; I believe it, though *more* difficult to the reason, with a firmness quite different from that with which I believe the account of a saint's crossing the sea on his cloak, though *less* difficult to the reason; for the one comes to me on the word of God, the other on the word of man.

The whole of what I have said in my recent lecture comes to this—that Protestants are most inconsistent and one-sided in *refusing to go into the evidence* for ecclesiastical miracles, which, on the first blush of the matter, are not stranger than those miracles of Scripture which they happily profess to admit. How is this the same as saying that *when* the grounds for believing those ecclesiastical miracles *are* entered on, God's word, through his Church, on which the Catholic rests the miracles of the law and the Gospel, is not a firmer evidence than man's word, on which rest the miracles of ecclesiastical history?

So very clear is this distinction between verisimilitude and evidence, and so very clear (as I consider) is my own line of argument founded on it, that I should really, for my own satisfaction, like your Lordship's assurance that you had carefully read, not merely dipped into, my lecture before you delivered your speech. Certain it is, that most people, though they are not the fit parallels of a person of your dispassionate and candid mind, judge of my meaning by bits of sentences, mine or not mine, inserted in letters in the newspapers.

Under these circumstances, I entertain the most lively confidence that your Lordship will find yourself able to reconsider the word "disgust," as unsuitable to be applied to state-

ments which, if you do not approve, at least you cannot very readily refute.

I am, my dear Lord, with every kind feeling personally to your Lordship, very truly yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN, Congr. Orat.

NO. 5. THE BISHOP OF NORWICH TO DR. NEWMAN.

Norwich, October 17.

MY DEAR NEWMAN,—One of the secretaries of the Bible Society has asked my permission to reprint what I said as chairman of the meeting at Norwich. I will most readily avail myself of this reprint to withdraw the expression “disgust,” as it appears to be offensive. I will also, as is due to you, have a note appended, referring to the passages in your writings to which my observations were more particularly directed, and stating that you disavow the construction which I put on them.

At the same time, I am unable still to come to any other conclusion than that of the dangerous tendency which I have represented them to have. If you maintain, as you distinctly do, not only the *antecedent probability* (*credibility* in that sense) of the legendary miracles, but your firm belief in certain of them, specifically stated, as *facts proved*; and if you further contend that these miracles are only a continuation of those recorded in Scripture, the impression appears to me inevitable, that the legendary channel through which God must have appointed them to be attested and preserved has a purpose and authority the same with Scripture. What I should fear is, not indeed that the generality of your readers will exalt legends into Scripture, but that, seeing grounds for discrediting the legends, they will look on all narratives of miracles, scriptural and legendary, as alike doubtful, and more than doubtful. In short, your view, as I see it, tends to a scepticism and infidelity of which I fully acquit you.

The report of your speech at Birmingham I read in the *Times*, but the quotation which I sent to Mr. Cobb I took from a letter in the *Spectator* of September 27, the writer's quotation, according with my impression of your speech as reported, containing words to that effect.

The kind present which you propose for me will, I assure you, be valued, if for no more, as a token that we are still friends, notwithstanding a wide severance in matters of faith, and that we may still believe all things and hope all things for one another.

My dear Newman, yours truly,
S. NORWICH.

No. 6. DR. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

Oratory, Birmingham, October 19.

MY DEAR LORD,—I thank your Lordship with all my heart for your very kind and friendly letter just received, and for your most frank and candid compliance with the request which I felt it my duty to make to you.

It is a great satisfaction to me to have been able to remove a misapprehension of my meaning from your mind. There still remains, I confess, what is no misapprehension, though I grieve it should be a cause of uneasiness to you—my avowal that the miraculous gift has never left the Church since the time of the Apostles, though displaying itself under different circumstances, and that certain reputed miracles are real instances of its exhibition. The former of these two points I hold in common with all Catholics; the latter on my own private judgment, which I impose on no one.

If I keep to my intention of making our correspondence public, it is, I assure you, not only as wishing to clear myself of the imputation which has in various quarters been cast upon my lecture, but also, in no slight measure, because I am able to present to the world the specimen of an anti-Catholic disputant, as fair and honourable in his treatment of an opponent, and as mindful of old recollections, as he is firm and distinct in the enunciation of his own theological view.

That the Eternal Mercy may ever watch over you and guide you, and fill you with all knowledge and with all peace, is, my dear Lord, the sincere prayer of

Yours most truly and faithfully,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Now the first thing that strikes us after reading these letters is the benumbing influence of that anti-Catholic feeling which could induce a person like Dr. Hinds to come before the public with a vehement personal attack on an old friend, on the mere report of two of the most notoriously untrustworthy sources of information. We call his remarks on Father Newman at St. Andrew's Hall vehement and personal, not as condemning them provided they had been based on careful inquiry, but as indicating the intensity of the feeling manifested, and its direction against one particular individual. Here, then, we have an Anglican prelate, most favourably distinguished from his episcopal brethren by general calmness of judgment, possessing intellectual powers and theological attainments far above the average of his fellow-religionists, himself the author of theological works of no mean pretensions, standing up before a motley assemblage of Methodists, Evangelicals, Latitudina-

rians, Socinians, and what not, and perilling his reputation and (we can hardly doubt) doing violence to his own kind feelings, in a needless onslaught on the valued friend of past years, *on the authority of a hired reporter in the Times, and an anonymous correspondent in the Spectator*; and this, although a word to his bookseller would have procured him his old friend's own printed statement of the opinions at which he thought right thus to utter his disgust. If such is the measure meted to Catholics by men like Bishop Hinds, what may we not expect from the vulgar, ignorant, passionate, heartless herd?

Yet let us do Dr. Hinds justice, and we can assure him we do it most ungrudgingly. If there are multitudes who would have imitated him in assailing an old associate on a trumpery newspaper report, there is scarcely one in a thousand who would have had the courage to avow, without shirking, the source on which they had relied. Most men, when questioned as Dr. Hinds was by Father Newman, would either have omitted all reply to his query, or would have laboured to throw dust in his eyes to conceal their own glaring fault. Well would it be for the cause of truth, if all who share the Bishop's rashness would imitate him in his candid confession.

Another point which strikes us, after perusing these remarkable letters, is the tone of Dr. Hinds' letter to Father Cobb. We probably do not far err if we say that it is the most civil epistle ever received by a Jesuit priest from the Protestant Bishop residing in the same town with himself; and the following sentence may be quoted as especially worthy of note, considering what is the position of its writer:—"It would be very satisfactory to me to have any authoritative disclaimer of these publications as exponents of your Church's views; for they alarm me, from their tendency to bring into discredit that faith which, notwithstanding the serious differences that unhappily divide us, we still, God be thanked, hold in common, and cherish in common."

It is, however, to the Bishop's letter of October 17th that we have particularly to draw attention. The following is the sentence in which Dr. Hinds states the conclusion he draws from Father Newman's careful and most lucid exposition of the Catholic doctrine and his own private opinion:—"If you maintain," says the Bishop, "as you distinctly do, not only the *antecedent probability* (*credibility* in that sense) of the legendary miracles, but your firm belief in certain of them, specifically stated, as *facts proved*; and if you further contend that these miracles are only a continuation of those recorded in Scripture; the impression appears to me inevitable, that the legendary channel through which God must have appointed

them to be attested and preserved has a purpose and authority the same with Scripture."

Now was ever such a conclusion drawn from such premises, except in anti-Catholic polemics? The very phraseology introduced by Dr. Hinds betrays his powerlessness in attempting to meet and do justice to Father Newman's statements. What, in the name of Aristotle, has an "*impression*" to do with a logical conclusion? Who ever heard of an "inevitable impression," as the deduction from certain definite premises? How came a clear-headed man like Dr. Hinds to employ such a term, except from a secret consciousness that the theory he is stating does *not* follow, as a *logical conclusion*, from the premises maintained by his correspondent.

And the matter of the "*impression*" is on a par with the terms in which it is expressed. Because a certain modern miracle is proved as an historical fact, and because it is one of a series commencing in the days of our Blessed Lord and the Apostles, *therefore* the books and traditions which record this miracle, *and which claim to be only common human testimony*, have a purpose and authority the same as Scripture, *which is the word of God!* On this principle, then, the Bible Society has a purpose and authority the same as that of the Apostles. The Bible Society circulates the word of God, so did the Apostles; and it professes to accomplish a work which was begun by St. Peter and St. Paul. But will any man in his senses claim a similar authority for the society and the two great Apostles?

Doubtless, viewed *merely* as an historical record of proved facts, the Bible has a purpose the same as that of the records of the ecclesiastical miracles. But the Catholic doctrine, as Father Newman has urgently enforced it on the Bishop, is, that the Bible is much more than a true historical record; and Dr. Hinds himself puts prominently forward his own belief that it is so. But how does this bear out Dr. Hinds in his conclusions on the Catholic doctrine? What does he mean by *authority*? Does he mean merely the weight to be attached to an authentic history, just as the *Times'* reporter was his "*authority*" for what Father Newman said at Birmingham? He does *not* mean this, for he says that the Bible is the word of God, and has an authority totally distinct from the authority of a merely competent and credible witness to a fact. What, then, *is* the source of such an incredible confusion of ideas and perversion of reasoning?

The secret is this: *Dr. Hinds does not believe the Bible to be the word of God.* He says he believes it to be so, and he thinks he so believes. We do not for a moment dispute or doubt his sincerity; but, in fact, he no more believes in the

Bible as the voice of God, than he believes in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* as an inspired record, simply because they are historically correct. His "inevitable impression" springs, not from Father Newman's premisses, as stated by Dr. Hinds, but from Dr. Hinds' own secret state of mind and thought. He reasons correctly, though not from his ostensible data. The purpose and authority of the record of a sufficiently-proved modern miracle is in his view identical with that of Scripture, because in reality Scripture to him is nothing more than a true book. He has long ago been doing, like nearly every Protestant, what he says that he fears Father Newman's readers will do. He has no *faith* in the Bible as the word of God; his distinction between the Bible and modern records is a verbal distinction. He has drawn a rigid line around every thing that is supernatural in the Bible, treating it with a formal courtesy, bowing to it, quoting it with scrupulous attention to its phraseology, circulating it in its entire form, that thereby he may conceal from himself the utter hollowness of his fancies respecting his own faith in it as of divine *authority*, and as essentially different *in kind* from any mere human records, however literally true. The Bible to Protestants is like the Lama of Thibet to his devotees,—an imaginary divinity, dwelling apart from mortals, enshrined in a halo of mystic secrecy, and never brought forth into the world, lest in the rude shock of opinion and criticism his claim to worship should be shattered to the winds. We repeat, that the Bible is *not* the word of God, in any tangible sense, in the estimation of acute, thinking, dispassionate men like the present Bishop of Norwich. It is an historically true book more or less; and therefore when the claim of historical truth is asserted for other records of supernatural events, they start aside with dismay, and cry out that the sanctity of Scripture is in danger, and its supremacy menaced by the encroachments of human claimants to a share in its empire.

We appeal from Dr. Hinds' letter to Dr. Hinds himself, and beg him to define what is his exact meaning when he speaks of the Bible as the word of God, as distinct from any other writing which is historically, but literally, true, though on purely human testimony.

What is the "inspiration" of the Bible? What is the metaphysical difference between the confidence he reposes in its statements, and that which he places in any narrative of events or spoken words of whose correctness he is morally certain? He is bound to answer these queries before he can make any progress towards upholding his assertion, that the Catholic doctrine puts the histories of the ecclesiastical miracles, in any true

sense, on a level with Scripture. And further, when the Bishop has defined the meaning of the term "inspiration" as applied to the Bible, and shewn the nature of the trust he reposes in the Scriptures, then we have a right to call for an exposition of the *grounds* on which he regards the Bible as inspired; and we are confident that if the Bishop of Norwich, or any other Protestant, will definitely and intelligibly answer our questions, it will appear that what they imagine to be *faith in the word of God* is nothing more than an intellectual conviction (more or less complete) that the book termed the Bible is historically a genuine, authentic, and trustworthy record of the words and actions therein preserved. And such being the case, we are undoubtedly perfectly willing to admit that, on Dr. Hinds' view, Father Newman places the history, or legend, or whatever we may call it, of the liquefaction of St. Januarius' blood on a level with the scriptural account of our Blessed Lord's resurrection. Legend and Scripture become equal, in the Protestant judgment, by the descent of Scripture to the region of legend.

Here, too, we are reminded to call further on Dr. Hinds for an explanation of what he means by a "legend," or a "legendary channel." As this word is generally used by Protestant controversialists, it simply begs the whole question in dispute. We do not say that Dr. Hinds deliberately designed any thing so grossly unfair, or transparently irrational; but we suspect that when he spoke of the "legendary channel" by which Catholic miracles are preserved, he unconsciously betrayed the fact that, in his own secret thoughts, he had prejudged the very point debated, or rather that he had not *judged* it at all, but had assumed from the first that a modern miracle is virtually an impossibility. In what ordinary sense, let us ask, can the miracle of St. Januarius be said to be conveyed by a "legendary channel?" Take, for example, the knowledge which the writer of these remarks possesses respecting the liquefaction of this saint's blood, or of that of St. Aloysius and of St. Pantaleon. He has received his knowledge of these miracles from an intimate personal friend, who has witnessed the several liquefactions under circumstances which render deception or error physically impossible. How is this to be set down as "legendary?" If it is to be disbelieved, there is an end of all human testimony; for the present writer undeniably has more reason to believe that the blood of St. Januarius is miraculously liquefied twice every year (and on several days each time), than he has for believing that the recent correspondence between Father Newman and Dr. Hinds is not a forgery.

Undoubtedly, if any person believes that the miracle of St.

Januarius *cannot* be true, there is an end of the matter; but then two consequences must follow. The first we have just named; *no human testimony can be trusted*: and secondly, *the Scripture miracles are false also*; for any reason that will prove a modern miracle, as such, impossible, will equally prove all miracles impossible. Again, then, we call upon the Bishop and others, who refuse to go with an unbiassed mind into the evidence for Catholic miracles, to state sufficient grounds for believing them impossible. To call them improbable in the highest degree, is ridiculous, *as a reply to the evidence on which some of them rest*. To assert, further, that they rest on the *ipse dixit* of the Catholic Church, is totally untrue; as it is equally untrue to allege that the Catholic Church imposes a belief in any miracles (except those of Scripture) on her children. We call upon those who say these things to point to *one* ecclesiastical miracle which Catholics are compelled to believe as a question of faith, and for disbelieving which a priest would be permitted to refuse them the Sacraments.

Once more; why do not our opponents—we speak, of course, of such thinkers as Bishop Hinds, and not of the ranting, fanatical crowd—why do not our opponents set themselves to master the first element of all religious knowledge; namely, the littleness of the human intellect, when it would dictate to Almighty God when and how He shall supernaturally interfere in the world which He has created? We know that all his works are done, as we say, according to certain fixed laws; by which, if we mean any thing not self-contradictory, we express the perfect harmony between the works of the Almighty and his own nature, which is one, unchangeable, and omniscient. Hence we know that what we term the supernatural manifestations of the divine power, are but a portion of the one great mighty whole of his government of creation; and that they are as truly in harmony with one another, and with the real principle on which the visible universe is framed, as the laws of gravitation, electricity, and chemical affinity are harmonious and interdependent. But for an intellect like ours to lay down beforehand the entire breadth, application, and modes of operation of the rules (so to speak) on which Almighty God will (as we phrase it) break in upon the *ordinary* action of physical agencies, is so preposterous, that it is difficult to believe that any moderately humble mind can bring itself to so monstrous an audacity. Apart from God's own express declarations, how is it possible for us to know when or how it is fitting for Him to interfere supernaturally in human affairs? What do we know of God's designs,

except what He has told us? What can be more childish than to call one thing great, and another thing little, in the sight of God, simply because they are great or little in our eyes? Is not the entire fabric of human existence, as our senses can take cognisance of it, one ceaseless series of rebukes to that pride of intellect which would measure grandeur and littleness by its own petty standard? Is it not all mystery; mystery unfathomable, awful, and humbling? What do we know of it, but what we have observed? Before me lie a few drops of a colourless fluid; they are so few, that they would lie upon a sixpence and not flow over. I put them upon my tongue, and before the sun sets, my soul is in eternity! What! does the destiny of an immortal being, a spirit, with all its glorious powers, depend in any degree upon the placing a few scarcely-visible drops of acid upon the tongue? What a tremendous, what an overwhelming consequence, from so contemptible a cause! Yet men who can see nothing mysterious or unfathomable in this, can laugh at the very notion of a saint's blood liquefying, as something so childish, silly, unmeaning, uncalled for, as not to be worth examining into as a possible reality. It is *not* unworthy of God to make the entrance of one man into eternity depend on the perhaps accidental absorbing of half-a-dozen drops of liquid into his blood; but it *is* unworthy of Him to console thousands and tens of thousands of his children by annually displaying his Omnipotence in causing the hardened blood of another man to grow liquid without the intervention of any visible or tangible agency! *Where*, let us ask, is the childishness to be found? *Who* are they who follow most zealously the Baconian rule of induction from facts? Is it the modest, philosophising, accurate, observant Catholic; or the contemptuous, self-satisfied, incredulous Protestant, who sits at home over his fire, and lays down laws for the governance of creation, founded on a personal knowledge which bears a far less proportion to the universe and its Creator, than a grain of sand to this earth and all the orbs in the boundless firmament? What do we know even of physical facts, except from observation? Who is so absurd as to refuse credence to the most novel and unexpected phenomena, when established by good evidence? What can be imagined more improbable than that a man should sit at a table in London, and talk with a man sitting at another table in Paris? Yet who denies the marvels of the electric telegraph, on the score of their immense antecedent improbability?

Undoubtedly, miraculous interference, *as such*, is improbable, so long as the natural course of the universe is in fact unaltered. Who denies this? Certainly no Catholic. An

extraordinary phenomenon, whether professedly depending on physical or on spiritual agencies, is not a *likely* thing. But are all extraordinary phenomena untrue?

Once more, the Bishop of Norwich, and others who think with him, are bound to reply to the argument urged by Father Newman, that miracles having once happened, are more likely to occur again than otherwise. Once improbable, they are now probable. It is sometimes pretended that the early miracles fulfilled all the ends for which they were designed, and that none are now called for. But what answer is this? How can we know beforehand that there is *no* purpose to be attained by miracles now? Am I God, or am I a man? Have I penetrated into the secrets of the Eternal, so that I can draw a barrier around his acts and say, the miracle He worked yesterday He shall not work to-day? Do I know enough of the ends He has in view, to be able to anticipate every possible exertion of his omnipotence which futurity can disclose? Once more, we deny, in the most emphatic terms, that it is within the compass of human knowledge to say when God shall work a miracle, or where, or why, or how.

If *any thing*, as we have said, is likely, it is, that miracles still continue. And this we say altogether apart from any deductions from the promise of continued miraculous power given by our Lord to his Church, for we are arguing with those who prefer what are termed "philosophical" grounds. It is on grounds universally admitted in all physical studies, that we demand a proof that what is likely in physicals is unlikely in spirituals. A thing once begun invariably continues. Why is this truth to be set aside in the question of miracles?

We conclude with a word or two on the fears expressed by Dr. Hinds as to the effect of Father Newman's statements on his readers. He says, that seeing grounds for discrediting the "legendary" miracles, Father Newman's readers will come to disbelieve the scriptural miracles. Does he mean his Protestant readers, or his Catholic readers? Certainly the *Catholic* reader will not do this, for he knows perfectly well that the two classes of miracles rest on totally different grounds. He never in his life heard the Bible narratives put on a level with the histories of the ecclesiastical miracles. Dr. Hinds may rest assured that *we* know the difference between the word of God and the word of man, even when best authenticated, too well ever to merge the one in the other. As a matter of fact, moreover, many Catholics *do* disbelieve very many miraculous histories which other Catholics believe to be genuine. Take this very miracle of the blood of St. Januarius. It is notorious that its reality is not believed by many amongst us, priests as well as

laity. Not that they are so silly or presumptuous as to believe it to be *false* without the most careful inquiry; but they suspend their judgment: they say, "We never looked into the evidence; we know it is generally considered to be a real miracle, but circumstances have not allowed us to investigate the matter; therefore, while we condemn no one for thinking differently, we reserve our personal opinion." And the same is said in innumerable other instances. On the other hand, if Father Newman's statement has any influence on his Catholic readers, so far from predisposing them to infidelity, it will predispose those who doubted the reality of the miracle of St. Januarius to regard its evidence with a more favourable eye. They will say, "Here is a well-known, cautious man of mature age, fully capable of appreciating evidence of all kinds, and with a keen perception of the weak points in every story, yet going almost out of his way to say that he considers the proof of *this* miracle irresistible, notwithstanding all the prejudices of his past life. I should very much like to look into the evidence myself."*

In truth, however, we do not suppose that Dr. Hinds meant his words to apply to Father Newman's Catholic, but to his Protestant readers; and we take it, that the idea which lay hid in his mind was not that palpably absurd one which at first sight his words, if applied to Protestants, express. For to utter a fear that men who already deny the reality of Catholic miracles will be led to scepticism simply by seeing grounds for discrediting what they have always stoutly rejected, is simply a truism, or something very like it. The idea which does haunt the Bishop's mind, we have little doubt, is this:—That the Protestant world is resolved to deny the Catholic miracles *at all costs*; that they have so slight a belief in *any* supernatural interference, that when pressed to a logical consistency by the demonstration of the truth of modern miracles, they will be prepared to embrace an utter scepticism (including a rejection of all human testimony) rather than bow down their intellects before a God present in the hated Church of Rome. And most truly and strictly do we agree with Dr. Hinds in anticipating this awful result. We see that the English mind has no true faith in the supernatural; that its imaginary belief in the reality of the Scripture miracles is a deception; that it knows but one reality—this visible universe; and that it worships a false god, namely, *itself*. And therefore the more urgently the evidences for Catholicism are pressed upon the English people, the more

* We may remind our readers that an article on the evidence for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius appeared in the *Rambler* for February 1861, to which we refer them.

fatally will many of them embrace openly that infidelity to which they are already (though, for the most part, unconsciously) enslaved. As time goes on, they *must* take their side. Shallowness and cant and establishmentarianism cannot stand for ever the shock of modern thought. Those who believe in a God must become Catholics; they who do not believe in Him will learn their own minds, and avow themselves, in some shape or other, not only Infidels, but Atheists.

Reviews.

ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH RATIONALISTS.

Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme. Par M.
l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens.

WE proceed, according to our promise, to give some account of our author's line of argument, to which, however, it is impossible to do justice in so short a notice. Neither can extracts give any adequate idea of the merits of this little treatise, which consist rather in the clear, impartial, and powerful manner in which the argument is drawn out, than in any peculiarly brilliant or striking passages.

The Abbé Gerbet thus sums up the various subjects with which Rationalism occupies itself: "It has its general doctrine on the constitution and independence of reason, starting from which, it embraces in its speculations the origin of things, the origin of man and of society, morality, justice, right, political power, social progress,—in fine, the great problem of a future life." He then proceeds to inquire whether on each of these points Rationalism does not become the source of ideas which, like so many streams, swell the torrent of communistic doctrines.

As it would exceed our limits to follow, in ever so cursory a manner, all the steps of this inquiry, we shall confine our observations to the first section, which treats of the constitution and independence of the reason; not because we should not find ample room in the further developments of rationalistic doctrine for establishing the identity in principle of Protestantism and Rationalism, and the consequent inability which the former shares with the latter of meeting successfully the

inroad of communistic doctrines, but because, being forced to select, we choose in preference the parent principle as the subject of our consideration. In doing so, we shall furnish a specimen of the general character of our author's argument. In his concluding chapter, he recapitulates the whole in parallel columns, from which we here insert an extract.

RATIONALISM.

The agreement of all nations with respect to the necessity of a revealed religion proves nothing against Rationalism.

This agreement has in it something factitious, for it has been brought about and maintained by corporations of priests.

The human mind tends necessarily to emancipate itself from the yoke of priests, because it passes through two phases: one, that of infancy, during which it lives instinctively on belief and tradition; the other, that of maturity, during which it substitutes a system of rational truths for the blind affirmations of faith.

COMMUNISM.

The agreement of all nations with respect to the necessity of hereditary property proves nothing against Communism.

This agreement has in it something factitious, for it has been brought about and maintained by corporations of proprietors.

Human society tends necessarily to emancipate itself from the yoke of proprietors, because it passes through two phases: one, in which it instinctively attaches itself to the principle of inheritance; the other, in which it substitutes a scientific organisation for the blind combinations which result from the accident of birth.

Our author commencing with the doctrine of Rationalism respecting human reason, and the consequences flowing therefrom, deprives the conservative Rationalist, at the very outset, of an argument of which he would willingly avail himself against the Communist. Wherever civil society has existed, we find the rights of property recognised and maintained. Of course not always respected; "but the principle has ever been admitted as an incontestable truth. Does not this universal consent look like the expression of a law of human nature?"

This argument, powerful as it must ever be from its very simplicity, and from its approving itself at once to all minds, to the uneducated as well as to the educated, to the simple as well as to the learned, the Rationalist has debarred himself from using with any justice by his own doctrine concerning the human mind. He has already discarded the principle of authority, and has, therefore, no right to employ it against others. He has discarded it, the Communist may urge, in connexion with "an order of things which men have, hitherto at least, agreed to regard as much more important than that (the material order) to which his own

theories apply. Have not all the nations of the earth agreed to recognise the need of a divine teaching, of a revealed and positive religion, descending from a source superior to the thoughts of man? Has this general consent, he may say, hindered you from proclaiming this belief to be an illusion, and declaring that there never has been any revelation made to man save that which his own reason affords him?" In vain may the Rationalist urge in justification of the revolution he has introduced into spiritual things, that during the infancy of man it was natural for him, from the very sense of his weakness and ignorance, to believe in superior influences and supernatural revelations. "Faith is the primitive instinct, the spontaneous impulse of the human soul. But to the age of spontaneous impulses has succeeded that of reflection; and reflection, at its highest degree, is philosophy. The mission of philosophy is to substitute the demonstration of realities for the illusions of faith." Why may not the Communist have recourse to the same plea? "The age of instinct, of spontaneous feeling and of faith, has been prolonged with respect to social as well as religious doctrines." Grant that belief in the rights of property, like the belief in an external revelation, was the simplest and most natural idea which would present itself to the human mind in its infancy, is not the age of reflection to succeed in the case of social as well as of religious doctrines?

Again, when the Rationalist asserts that the early belief in a divine revelation has been artificially kept up "by sacerdotal corporations, whose interest it was to constitute themselves the interpreters of heaven, that they might secure to themselves the dominion of earth," the Communist may reply, "We say of proprietors what you say of priests. Proprietors have ever formed a privileged corporation, which has held the people in dependence. They have made property a holy thing. Proprietors have been the priests of matter, who have worked, for their own profit, upon man's desire for order and upon his sense of justice."

Now the conservative Protestant may imagine that all this affects him but little. *He* does not deny the fact of a revelation: true, but we believe that the whole weight of the argument nevertheless falls upon him. He denies the *principle* of authority, and consequently the argument drawn from it; for the precise question here is, not whether the fact of a revelation be true, but whether the argument drawn from early and general consent be a valid one. Now the Protestant cannot but acknowledge—nay, he glories in the boast—that Protestantism has effected a complete spiritual and intellectual revo-

lution in the minds of men; substituting a reasonable belief for a blind faith, appealing to the individual and private judgment of each, and subjecting divine truths to human reason, by giving to the latter the unrestrained and unrestrainable right of pronouncing upon them. It makes nothing to him that this is an entirely new conception of man's attitude in respect to religious truth; that all the past ages of the world are against him; that all men, Pagans, Jews, and Christians, have alike agreed in accepting revelation as a thing external, positive, and uncompromising, something which claims the submission of man's reason, instead of subjecting itself to its examination. No, the world was then in its infancy, and men were easily deluded by priests, whose interest it was to constitute themselves as mediators between God and the conscience of man, and to shackle the human intellect that they might reign over it. But Protestantism has poured in a flood of new light, which will ultimately dispel the darkness and error that encompassed our ancestors, and still envelops the larger portion of humanity.

We see not, therefore, how the Protestant, who makes light of the general consent of all ages as to the attitude of man's mind in respect to revelation, can have any right to plead that consent where a social principle is involved. We have so far, however, proved what, it may be said, has a merely negative bearing. As our author truly observes, "the result which we have shewn to flow from this (rationalistic) doctrine certainly frees Communism from the obligation of deferring to the authority of general consent in favour of property; but it does not prove that it directly produces Communism, which denies the rights of property." Let us proceed, then, to examine it with our author a little further.

RATIONALISM.

The constitution of the human mind requires that the reason of each man should be independent of the reason of every other man, and consequently he must possess an equal right to acquire that knowledge which forms his intellectual domain.

All intellectual inequality resulting from any other cause than inequality of capacity, is a violation of the natural independence of the reason of each man: there

COMMUNISM.

The constitution of society cannot be made conformable with the independence of the reason of each man, except so far as he is enabled to participate equally in those material means by which he acquires that knowledge which forms his intellectual domain.

All social inequality founded on the hereditary transmission of goods, and consequently resulting from another cause than that of personal capacity, is radically

ought not to exist a privileged class in the intellectual domain.

No man can admit as true any thing of which he has not discovered the truth by the activity of his own reason.

The human mind is a democracy of sovereign intelligences: the principle of authority is incompatible with the full development of their free activity in the intellectual order.

Rationalism asserts the spiritual sovereignty of each individual, that is, "the right of forming by his own judgment, and independently of all authority, those opinions upon which his intellectual, moral, and social life depend." Such a right must be "equal for all men. Independence either exists not at all, or exists wholly and entirely." Such is the first consequence of this doctrine: the second is as clearly deducible. This "intellectual sovereignty confers on each man the right of possessing a mass of knowledge forming the domain over which this sovereignty is to be exercised; otherwise it would remain a barren abstraction." Now it requires no laboured chain of reasoning to shew that, if each man possesses "an equal right to procure for himself, according to the limits of his capacity, that knowledge which is to constitute his domain," the social order ought, in all justice, to be "organised in a manner corresponding to the constitution of the human mind;" it ought to place each man in a position to employ as freely as his neighbour those external means by which the riches of the intellect are acquired; for knowledge, by means of which the intellectual faculty is cultivated, is not acquired, as all men know, by a mere internal process. "The total sum of knowledge, of which man stands in need, comes almost wholly from without." Now "the same causes which give to rich and poor so unequal a share in material goods, establish also between them, as respects the life of the mind, a permanent inequality. Doubtless the Communists are highly consistent when they require as an indispensable preliminary the universal establishment of gratuitous schools obligatory upon all classes." But this would but palliate the existing evil, as our author shews at some length in a passage which our limits forbid us to quote. It must be plain, however, to all, that

unlawful; since, by furnishing the rich with means of instruction of which others are deprived, it creates a privileged class even in the intellectual domain.

No man can legitimately possess any thing of which he has not acquired the enjoyment by his own labour.

Society is a democracy of sovereign wills: the principle of hereditary transmission is incompatible with the full development of their free activity in the material order.

the rich under all circumstances would possess advantages in the matter of education, which his lot in life denies to the poor man.

Such, then, is the state of the question; there is a radical antagonism between the constitution of the human mind (according to the Rationalists) and the constitution of society as it actually exists. "The rationalistic principle gives each man equal rights to the possession of intellectual riches; property opposes to these rights an irremediable inequality. Which of these principles is to prevail?"

"Thus we see that Rationalism has long been deluding itself. It believed that it was sufficient to destroy all spiritual authority, and to substitute the intellectual sovereignty of the individual, in order at once to place the human mind in its normal state; it little suspected that this revolution in the world of mind was to re-act upon the material basis of society. Had any one said to the Rationalist, 'Many years shall not pass before men shall come, in the name of your principle, to dispute with you the possession of the arm-chair in which you are seated, of the inkstand in which you dip the pen which records this very principle;'—had any one, I say, uttered such a prophecy as this, he would have regarded him as a madman. He slumbered on peacefully upon the faith of his theory; it was the period of his philosophic beatitude. This period is past, and terrible has been his awaking. Rationalism said, *Why* should not the reason of each man be independent? Communism has replied, *How* shall it be so? It has raised the question of ways and means. It has said that it is not enough to proclaim a right, but that it is necessary to establish it. It has asked whether it were possible for men to enjoy equal intellectual rights as long as the social system, in respect to property, perpetuates an unequal share of those means by which the riches of the intellect are acquired."

It is hardly necessary to point out the identity which exists between the principle of private judgment, which forms the basis of Protestantism, and that of the sovereignty of human reason, which is the great dogma of Rationalism. The right of private judgment, which Protestantism claims for each individual, gives to the reason that very independence of all authority for which the Rationalist so loudly contends. It is true that the religious Protestant repudiates the consequences of the doctrine for which he is so zealous; he repudiates them because they are evidently subversive of all religion. He says, "It is true you have the right of private judgment; but not only are you responsible for the use you make of it, but should you allow it to conduct you to such and such opinions,

you will undoubtedly be guilty of having made a bad use of it." But the Protestant has forfeited the right to lay any such restriction on the liberty of private judgment. Independence exists, as the Abbé Gerbet says, or it does not exist; reason is sovereign, or it is subordinate to some authority. There is and can be no medium. The Protestant, however, endeavours to place the Bible as a rampart between himself and infidelity. Instead of putting forward his doctrine concerning private judgment in the naked and startling form in which the Rationalist loves to exhibit it, he clothes it with a seeming deference to authority, which pacifies the misgivings of the religious-minded, and throws dust in the eyes of the unreflecting. He asserts that no one is to be required to believe any thing which cannot be proved from Scripture; that is, of course, any thing which cannot be proved to his own satisfaction; for if compelled to accept what was proved only to the satisfaction of his teacher, where were his boasted freedom? But how short a step separates this position from the following: No one is to be required to believe that the Scriptures contain the word of God, unless this also can be satisfactorily proved to his reason. And not only is it a short step, but it is a step which the Protestant can, upon no consistent ground, deny to man's reason the right to take.

Without, however, dwelling any further upon the infidel consequences which flow as naturally from the Protestant doctrine of private judgment, so idolised by the great majority of our countrymen, as from the rationalistic principle of the sovereignty of reason, we rather desire at present to shew that the same irremediable inconsistency exists between the supposed rights of the human mind, according to the principles of Protestantism, and the constitution of society, as M. Gerbet has shewn to exist between rationalistic doctrines and the same social system. Nay, the case is much worse. If the exercise of private judgment upon the text of Scripture be not merely a right but a duty, since it is set forth as the means by which the mind of man becomes enriched with divine truth, how shall we characterise a social system which not only does not place every man in an equally favourable position for exercising this all-important right and duty, as far as his natural faculties will permit, but actually throws insurmountable impediments in the way? We hear a great deal, it is true, of every poor man having his Bible; and supposing this were as literally true as the most zealous Protestant could desire, what were the use of it unless every poor man could read? and what were the use of his being able to read, unless his intellect had been sufficiently cultivated to

enable him to understand at least the meaning of the words he reads? Nor were that sufficient. Is the true sense of every verse of the Bible so clear, and the harmony of the whole so self-evident, that a general understanding of the words of Scripture, supposing this were ordinarily attainable by the poor man, would be sufficient to render him as competent to form an independent opinion as one whose mind has been enlarged by education and enriched with kindred knowledge? No, no; the poor man himself knows well enough that his social position, and consequent deficiency of education, act disadvantageously upon his ability to understand the sense of the very easiest book that falls into his hands; and who will pretend to say that the Bible is such a very easy book? How often do we not hear the complaint, or the excuse, as the case may be, of the poor man, that he is "no scholar," put forth to account for his ignorance of religious truths, and his inability to understand even what he has the faculty of reading. It is plain, then, that the poor and uneducated, at least, must ever receive their belief on the authority of their teachers, and are utterly debarred from forming that independent judgment which Protestantism asserts as the inalienable right and the sacred duty of each individual. There is, then, a "radical inconsistency" between the rights and duties of the human mind, as respects revealed truth, and the "constitution of society as it actually exists." Does not this give the Communist a fearful advantage in argument? Let us hear our author: "It is impossible not to see that communistic Rationalism occupies logically a much stronger position than conservative Rationalism, when it maintains that society ought ultimately to mould itself upon the constitution of the human mind. The fundamental law of the human mind is essential order, independently of all human convention; a social system always implies a conventional element; and moreover, according to a theory common to all Rationalists, society itself is but the result of a pact. How, then, should that which is in itself essential order perpetually give way to that which, to become a rule, has need of being ratified by a convention? Intellectual sovereignty is the highest right of the intellect; the right of property, to hold good as a doctrine, ought also to have its source in the intellect; how, then, should a combination of ideas, the whole value of which depends on its conformity with the reason of man, for ever prevail against the realisation of the highest right of the intellect, on which all doctrines depend?"

Rationalism might learn from Catholicism the obligations which faith in a great principle lays upon those who hold it. Catholicism establishes a law of obedience for minds, as

Rationalism establishes a law of independence. The authority which promulgates dogmas and duties is for Catholicism what the sovereignty of each individual intellect, which has to construct for itself all the truths necessary to man, is for Rationalism. It ought to have as much reliance on all the consequences of its theory, as Catholicism has on all the consequences of its own principle. Now what does Catholicism do? It declares first of all (and in this it is most consistent), that all that forms an obstacle to the development of its principle, that is, to the free exercise of spiritual authority, is radically unlawful. Why should not Rationalism have the courage to make the same declaration against a social system which arrests in the greatest number of minds the development of intellectual sovereignty? What does Catholicism do next? It is patient, indeed, with obstacles; it knows how to wait when it is not possible to remove them at once; but though it abstains from precipitating consequences, so far from repudiating them, the very abstinence which it imposes on itself is only a means for more effectually securing their realisation. Instead of arming itself with this courageous patience, which advances prudently towards its end, why should Rationalism shrink back affrighted from the consequences which in the practical order flow from that fundamental right, which in theory it proclaims? What does Catholicism do besides? Did it allow itself to be discouraged by the apparently insurmountable obstacles which confronted it at its very origin? In the ancient world, society rested upon the confusion of the spiritual and temporal power; the men of that time could see nothing but an utter overthrow of all order in the reversing of this principle. They could not conceive society organised upon any other basis. Catholicism told them that this idea was a mere chimera; it predicted that this organisation was to be dissolved, and that society would find its advantage in being constructed on a new principle. Why should not Rationalism have like faith in the future results of its own principle? If Catholicism had not absolutely insisted on its principle as a sovereign rule, to which social facts were to yield, it would not have accomplished its work, or it would but have half effected it. This is why, add the Communists, conservative Rationalism (and we may say also conservative Protestantism), which sacrifices the necessary results of its fundamental dogma to social facts, is henceforth condemned to impotency, and must give place to another doctrine."

There are, in fact, but two kinds of consistency; the one that of error, and the other that of truth. As every truth is

part of a whole, and bound up with the rest, so every error is likewise part of a whole, one vast and terrible negation of all truth; of God himself, and of all that is divine in his works; of all morality, therefore, as well as of all religion. God is himself essential order, and the fountain of order. Truth is order, and error is disorder. It is a kingdom of disorder: *terra miseriæ et tenebrarum, ubi umbra mortis et nullus ordo, sed sempiternus horror inhabitat.* There is a divine consistency, and there is a satanic consistency; there is the Catholic Church and infidelity; but midway between these there is no consistency; as in these latter days men, we believe, are destined to discover, and that perhaps sooner than many may imagine. The principles which the ruling class in this nation maintain, being fundamentally identical with those of Rationalism, contain in germ not only infidelity, but the disruption of social order. The maintainers of them, therefore, recoiling, as they do, from all consequences which would threaten the latter and proclaim the former, are struck with the same incapacity of effecting any good, or of stemming the tide of evil, with which our author taxes the conservative Rationalists of his own country. They have but the fatal power of propagating and recommending a principle of error, for the full and consistent application of which the great masses of our population will by and by become eager and clamorous.

We should have wished, if possible, to follow our author step by step in his examination, and to make some remarks on the spread of Pantheism in this country, and its secret connexion with Protestantism; on the opinions prevalent with respect to the indefinite progress of the human race, and the mere naturalness of the aims which men profess and follow, to the entire exclusion of the supernatural end of man; as though the latter were, as Protestants commonly say, "a matter between God and a man's conscience"—in other words, an object not to be taken into account where temporal questions are concerned; on the blow given to the rights of property by the appropriation of the property of the Church, with which Protestantism here, as elsewhere, began; on the tendency ever since exhibited to worship the omnipotence of the State, first in the person of the reigning sovereign, as long as the supreme power absolutely resided in his hands, and at the present time in the will of Parliament—a tendency strongly evinced in what we may call the ungodly respect with which an act of the legislature is regarded—law, as established by Queen, Lords, and Commons, being as it were set in the place of, or identified with, the law of God; so that men seem incapable of so much as realising the duty or possibility of a conscientious

opposition to it; on the feeling, so common also in this country, that the animal called "the public" (which, by the way, is a thoroughly Pagan idea), that is, the dominant class which can make its voice heard, must be gratified at all costs, even at the expense of all equity and justice; and lastly, on the so-called liberal views upon the subject of education, and their identity in principle with a monopoly of it by the government for its own special ends, which monopoly constitutes the State the sole proprietor of the national intellect. Upon these and kindred subjects, suggested by the remainder of our author's argument, which he develops in a very clear and satisfactory manner, we should have had much to say, at which we must be content, as it is, merely to hint; and referring our readers to M. Gerbet's able articles, leave them to make an application which has appeared to ourselves sufficiently obvious to call for the most serious reflection.

THE PROTESTANT CRITICISING.

1. *Notes of a Residence in the Canary Islands, the South of Spain, and Algiers; illustrative of the State of Religion in those Countries.* By the Rev. Thomas Debary, M.A. Rivingtons.
2. *What is the Working of the Church of Spain? What is implied in Submitting to Rome? What is it that presses hardest upon the Church of England?* A Tract by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. J. H. Parker.
3. *Heresy and Immorality considered in their respective bearing on the Notes of the Church. Being a final Letter to the Editor of the Guardian.* By William George Ward, author of "One Word on the Existing Constitution of the Anglican Establishment," and of two previous Letters. Burns and Lambert.
4. *The Spectator Newspaper*, No. 1213.

IT is difficult for a Catholic always to maintain a due gravity when he hears it said that man is a "reasoning" animal. Notwithstanding the existence of Euclid's *Elements*, Newton's *Principia*, Bacon's *Novum Organon*, and the *Nautical Almanac*, it is not easy to believe that mankind in general are gifted with common sense, or that they believe in the laws of

logic. Observing the average Protestant's notions of reasoning in the case of Catholicism and Catholics, one is tempted to imagine that it is only by a kind of happy accident that he anticipates the rising of to-morrow's sun in the east, and its setting in the west; or that he eats the dinner which his cook has prepared, without fear of poison. *How* men who write and speak of the Catholic Church, as nearly all Protestants write and speak, can possess the great gift by which man is supposed to be distinguished from the lower animals, is, in truth, a phenomenon almost as inexplicable as the marvels of mesmerism, or the nature of chemical affinities.

We do not mean, of course, that the mere fact that the bulk of the English nation remains Protestant, is a proof that it is not gifted with the reasoning faculty. Ignorance, general incapability, and other like causes, may and do preserve it in its unbelief. Some men are free-traders, some protectionists, some republicans, some monarchists, some hydropathists, some homœopathists, some believers in nothing but the London pharmacopœia, some may even believe in Lord John Russell and the Whigs; and yet none of them can be charged by their opponents with any thing approaching to an incapacity for drawing conclusions from premises. It is only when the Protestant intellect comes into direct contact with Catholicism, that it declares its hostility to the laws of reason, puts on the cap-and-bells, and proclaims itself independent of all logic and experience.

Now and then, of course, an exception appears to the universal rule. A positively reasonable, straightforward, intelligent controversialist enters the field, uses language in its ordinary sense, makes free use of his eyes and ears, scouts impossibilities, and preserves at once his equanimity and his knowledge of syllogisms. But such an anti-Catholic writer is a phenomenon rare indeed. If an individual Catholic meets with half-a-dozen such reasoning opponents during the course of his life, he is fortunate beyond his fellows. For the most part, he will find that those Protestants who, on certain occasions, have appeared to possess the full use of their faculties on religious subjects, are really no better than their neighbours, and at some unexpected moment exhibit polemical demonstrations at which he hardly knows whether to laugh or weep.

We assure our Protestant readers that this is not a mere outburst of personality, or rhetorical exaggeration. It is the conviction of Catholics who have been led to observe the phenomena of anti-Catholicism, that it is all but visionary to expect their opponents to follow the laws of right reasoning in their

controversies with the Catholic Church. The world without us imagines that a Catholic is perpetually undergoing a species of intellectual torture, resulting from the struggle in his mind between the demands of his faith and the dictates of his common sense. They portray to their imaginations some unhappy layman, terrified by his priests, or preyed upon by a guilty conscience, or stimulated by a morbid fanaticism, deliberately, though not without bitter anguish, stifling the voice of his reason, shutting his eyes to facts, ignoring all past history, and consciously accepting absurdities which he shrewdly suspects to be no better than impostures or dreams.

Yet what is the truth? A man need be a Catholic but for four-and-twenty hours to ascertain the fact, that we live in one perpetual condition of amazement at the intellectual incapacity and unfairness which Protestantism betrays in all its dealings with us. True it is, that in order to understand how low the human intellect can be degraded, it is necessary to be a Catholic; though not in the sense in which non-Catholics mean it. It is necessary to be a Catholic, in order to appreciate the coolness, the hardihood, the incomprehensible unconsciousness, the brazen perverseness, with which the Protestant critic remarks on the history, doctrines, and writings of Catholics; at once falsifying our statements, imputing to us impossibilities, closing his ears to our explanations, and tossing to the winds those rules of argument which he would not violate for the world in any case in which Catholicism was not the subject under discussion. In Protestant estimation, a Catholic's feelings towards heretics are a mixture of hatred, bloodthirstiness, envy, jealousy, intellectual fear, and unwilling respect. They are convinced that if we could, we would burn them all in Smithfield before a month had passed; and that, meanwhile, we live in a sort of awe-struck, savage veneration of their abilities, their learning, their acuteness, and the terrible cogency of their anti-Catholic argumentation. Yet all this time, whatever be the differences of view that individual Catholics maintain respecting their Protestant fellow-creatures, it is certain that in one opinion we are all agreed. Whatever we may think of their morals, of their amiability, of their sincerity, of their errors, we are perfectly unanimous, priests and laity, rich and poor, educated and illiterate, in regarding a profound ignorance, and a systematic violation of the laws of reason, as the very life of Protestantism in all its phases.

At the same time, for ourselves, we must confess that with all our knowledge of the perverseness of unbelief, we are sometimes quite astonished at the exuberant freshness with

which this perverseness betrays its vitality in ten thousand varying forms. We find it difficult to realise the full extent of the intellectual despotism under which the popular Protestant mind is ever—we cannot say *groaning*, for it sings amidst its fetters—but labouring. Here, at last, we say to ourselves, is something that it is impossible to misrepresent; here at least is a candid and rational observer; here is an argument which must be fairly met, or certainly such and such a Protestant will be convinced. Not the least in the world! There is our adversary swearing that black is white with a coolness perfectly inimitable; here is an interpretation of our words setting at defiance grammar and dictionary and etymology; what our opponent admitted yesterday, he now denies; what he condemned yesterday, he now upholds; all that we can say goes for nothing; and in the sacred name of reason he scorns every proof, and laughs at every fact that is laid before him.

Some curious illustrations of one or two of the most common of these anti-logical devices of our opponents have lately fallen in our way in the publications placed at the head of these remarks. They furnish a few specially notable instances of the determination with which Protestants persist in criticising the Catholic Church on the supposition that she holds those very doctrines which she formally and by her very constitution repudiates; and in finding fault with Catholic writers for not doing what they never for a moment professed to do. Here we have two Anglican clergymen, of the Puseyite school, flying, *more Anglicano*, through a few spots in Spain, picking up every scrap of information which they can lay hold of from any chance quarter to which they may have had access, themselves possessing, we suspect, nothing more than a superficial acquaintance with the Spanish language; then generalising, not even upon these poor fragments of facts, but upon their *interpretations* of them, and incontinently publishing to their tarry-at-home brethren that, bad as is the English Establishment tried by the Puseyite standard, the Catholic Church in Spain (and elsewhere) is infinitely worse. All this while, the criticising Protestant seems totally unaware that the Catholic Church never professes to make all her children saints, or even religious men. Messrs. Debary and Meyrick, with the correspondents of the latter gentleman, write upon the hypothesis that Catholicism is identical with Plymouth-Brotherism, or the notions of the old *Cathari*, or any other heretical sect which maintains that the visible Church is exactly co-extensive with the predestinated. It never occurs to them, moreover, that the accidental persons whom they, as Protestant English-

men, are likely to fall in with, or to whom they may even get introductions, are pretty sure not to be the best specimens of Catholicism in any foreign country. They forget that foreigners do not entertain precisely the same opinion of the *genus* Englishman which that *genus* entertains of itself, and that the chances are twenty to one that the Italian or Spanish acquaintances of the travelling British Protestant are the most lax or even scandalous children of the Catholic Church. All this is nothing, however, to your Anglican critic. He is scandalised if Spain is not a heaven upon earth, if the muleteers are not theologians, and the innkeepers not saints. And thus he hastens rapidly on, snatching at every trivial word or occurrence, multiplying units into thousands, exceptions into rules, and serving up the few floating details of what he *really* saw and heard in a sea of sauce compounded of interpretations, imputations, deductions, insinuations, and surmises. The flavour of the whole he takes good care shall be accommodated to the taste of the Protestant palate; and he knows full well that not one in a hundred of his readers will have either the ability or the inclination to sift his facts from his impressions, or to see with any other eyes than those of the traveller himself.

Of the two writers on Spanish affairs, Mr. Debary is the dullest, and Mr. Meyrick (in whom we include the friends whose letters he edits) the most illogical. They both of them manifestly would give their ears for a recognition of their orders, and are ever on the look-out for some occasion on which to speak of "Rome and England" as "sister churches." An excessive soreness, nevertheless, resulting from "Rome's" unnatural disregard to the relationship claimed by "England," is perpetually manifest in all the travellers alike, prompting them to an unfavourable interpretation of every thing they see and hear.

Mr. Debary's delinquencies in this way, though he is the least bitter of the party, constitute the chief fault in his book, and they now and then become actually ludicrous. They may be taken as a fair specimen of the argumentative worth of his deductions, and of the perverseness which besets the Protestant traveller, on which we have just remarked. One of his favourite methods of insinuation is to give a meaning to the *looks* of Spanish ecclesiastics. Here is one of such, at Las Palmas:

"During Passion-week there was a gauze curtain drawn over the 'Presbyterio,' or that part of the building which would answer to our chancel, where the priests officiated; but on Good Friday, as the veil of the temple was rent in twain, this curtain was removed.

When the procession issued out of the church, the crowd was immense; the figures were some degrees bigger than life, and borne aloft of the populace, who moved along, a dense uncovered mass, and I suspect a jealous mass likewise; for I chanced to be standing in some out-of-the-way place, some distance from the procession, with my hat on, when I was recognised, and peremptorily told to uncover,—which of course I was not foolish enough to decline doing. I well remember the face and figure of a priest who always headed these processions; he was a good-looking man of about eight-and-twenty or thirty, and as they chanted the Latin hymn, there was a smile, *nay almost a look of saucy triumph*, on his countenance, as if he knew he was conducting a never-failing appeal to the feelings of the people."

Here, again, is an "*I have been told*," followed by an *infallible* proof.

"*I have been told* that some of the mountain curés are not much men of peace, and that a *few* of them kept up a correspondence with the contrabandists. I have seen them sometimes jogging along, *looking as little like priests as they could do*: enough so to satisfy me that secular tastes are not confined to our own clergy."

Does Mr. Debary believe that *he* looked like a priest in the eyes of the Spaniards?

On the other hand, at Cadiz, he attributes the "thoughtful and scholar-like expression" of the face of the bishop to the influence of "study and the *Romish faith* combined."

At Seville, our traveller is introduced by *his landlady* to three Spanish ladies, one of whom he was told was married, though she still bore her maiden name. This he coolly says he did not believe; and why? Because "*she had the marble look of a nun*."

Then he goes on to say:

"These three ladies accompanied us to the cathedral. On entering the chapel to the right, as you come into the cathedral from the west, we began to examine a picture of San Lauriano carrying his head in his hand after martyrdom. One of our party, upon regarding this, could hardly suppress a laugh, and remarked to one of the ladies, 'Señora, can you believe in this extravagance?' The lady did not even deign to smile, but looked very serious; and one of the others, however I believe not really the most devout, came forward, and said deliberately, 'Why should we not believe it? All things are possible with God: it is not a bit more wonderful that He should make a flower spring from a seed, than that one of his saints should glorify Him by walking with his head in his hand.'"

May we ask Mr. Debary, by what possible means he discovered that this lady was not as devout as her companions?

We suspect, whatever they thought of the Englishman's devotion, they were pretty well agreed as to his controversial powers.

Here is another instance of Mr. Debary's gift for interpreting countenances, mixed up with a piece of blasphemy which we were hardly prepared for in one who possesses at least some little measure of religion, and of faith in the Incarnation. He is giving an account of what he saw on the festival of the Immaculate Conception at Seville.

"The music struck up; the boys, wearing this costume of Philip the Third, chanted antiphonally a hymn to the Virgin. They then began to dance, singing at the same time; at last, putting their plumed caps on their heads, they accompanied themselves with their castanets.

"During the whole of this ceremony, the Archbishop, habited as a Cardinal, was on his knees, looking up at the *viril* containing the Host; whilst a gauze curtain, fitted to the rim of the crown, was being gradually drawn over that which hundreds present regarded as nothing more nor less than Deity itself. The Archbishop's countenance all this time appeared most grave.

"The Jesuit turned to me and said, 'This, which makes you laugh, makes me cry.' He wronged me here; on the contrary, I was myself melted at the spectacle. After the Archbishop had given the blessing, Theofilo took me to the celebrated image of the Virgin carved by Juan Martinez Montanes. The expression in Theofilo's face was not pleasing; there was a look of admiration which recalled a story I had heard respecting a veneration paid to the Virgin better adapted to the goddess of the Zidonians. I throw it out as a speculation, whether the adoration of the Virgin could ever rise to any height amongst a very moral people. After having seen Christianity working in many different countries, it is hard not to believe that indigenous prejudices are represented in the particular customs of individual churches. By these alone any one might take a map of the world, and trace upon it the ancient empire of Rome; and, remembering the empire of Venus, it is only in this way one can account for the blasphemous veneration paid to the Mother of our Lord.

"May I be pardoned if I wrong my Spanish friend?—but the expression of his countenance, as he extolled the very exquisite face of this figure, to say the least, had more of Platonic than divine love about it."

Yet this miserable man imagines that he venerates Jesus, the Son of Mary, as the Son of God. We may notice also, that it is quite rare for him to condescend to call our Blessed Lady any thing more than "the Virgin." May Mary pray for him, that grace may touch his heart some day when he is reading in his place in the Anglican service, "Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me *blessed*."

At Seville, again, we have this specimen of reasoning:

“When the organ opened its mighty voice, and the men and women all bowed for the benediction, I felt considerably impressed with the spectacle; but as I was yielding to this feeling, a Scotchman, whom I had seen at Lisbon, came up to me and said, ‘What mummary!’ I fear a good deal of it was mummary; but the most magnificent external worship need not be mummary, or God would not have vouchsafed to the children of Israel so minute a description of how He chose to be worshipped, nor would the Levitical priesthood have been clothed in such magnificent robes: but the question after all is, ‘Have these things, or have they not, passed away?’ I, for one, cannot believe that a return to customs as burdensome as Judaism can be agreeable to the true spirit of Christianity.”

How does Mr. Debary know that the customs which he reprobates, even in the same breath that he confesses their solemnising power, are *burdensome* to the Catholics of Spain, or of any part of the world? Did any Catholic, with the slightest pretensions to seriousness, ever tell him so? Doubtless they are a burden, and a mummary, and a mockery, to some persons; but only to unbelievers like Mr. Debary, who are strangers to the love, the glory, and the *real presence* of that adorable Saviour in whose honour these rites are practised, and for whose sake alone his Blessed Mother and his beloved saints are worshipped by his faithful Church on earth.

Mr. Debary, however, is mild and syllogistic in comparison with Mr. Meyrick and his correspondents. When shall we meet with a controversialist who will allow that we know our own creed better than he does himself, and who will not quarrel with our conclusions until he has overthrown our premisses? Here is Mr. Meyrick, on the first page of his “Tract from Oxford,” telling us that “the ludicrous misconceptions of the religion of ‘the English heretics’ that one meets abroad, are almost beyond belief.

“During last Lent the writer was in Naples; and seeing some graves in what he understood to be unconsecrated ground, close to ‘Virgil’s Tomb,’ he inquired if those who were buried there had died infidels. ‘Yes,’ answered one of the guides in perfect simplicity, ‘they were English.’ ‘Yes,’ quoth the other, ‘they were Protestants,’ as if either assertion clenched the matter. In fact, the names were German. In Rome, a devout old woman informed him solemnly, that the only thing which ‘i poveri Inglesi’ had by way of baptism was, that some rose-water was poured over them.”

Is Mr. Meyrick really not yet aware that Catholics believe that the Roman Catholic faith *alone* is the revelation of Jesus Christ, and that those who reject it (all Protestants in the number) are—to use a strictly correct term—unbelievers, *i. e.*

infidels? As to the "devout old woman," whom he makes the exponent of Catholic opinion, we suspect she must have been reading the *English Churchman*, the *Guardian*, and other Puseyite periodicals, and formed her ideas of Protestant baptism from the accounts of the administration of that sacrament in the pages of those suicidal publications. We cannot wonder that as Mr. Meyrick takes his views from an old woman in Naples, so in England he accepts Mr. Pugin's *Earnest Appeal* by way of an historical statement of the spiritual life (or rather death) of the mediæval and French Church.

When, from Mr. Meyrick's speculations, we come to the letters of his friends, which form the staple of his tract, we have the old story over again and again. There are a few facts, and a host of "It is said's," "I know's," "It is true's," "It is a fact's," "He knew's," "I look upon's," "evidently's," &c., with all the changes of phrase by which a crafty writer contrives to make his interpretations pass for personal knowledge, and solitary instances stand muster as universal truths. When properly analysed, the real things which A. B. and C. D. really saw or heard with their own eyes and ears of the Church in Spain, are as little to the discredit of Spanish Catholicism as need be, while much is very greatly to her honour. That A. B. and C. D. met with bad, unbelieving Catholics, was natural; for there always are, and always have been, bad, unbelieving Christians *every where*, from the days of Judas Iscariot and Ananias and Saphira. We are only surprised that these wandering Protestants met with so much that was so good as to command even their reluctant homage. We can afford room for little more than a few examples of the travellers' peculiarities in the way of reasoning and gathering truths.

"*It is said* that the little boys who assist at Mass are the most adroit of the pickpockets."

"*It is true* that religious parents have hardly dared to let their daughters confess."

A preacher in his sermon tells the story of the rich fool in the Gospel, "to the great edification of my next neighbour, *who had evidently never heard it before!*" Is it a fact, then, that when a hearer is greatly edified by what he hears in a sermon, it is a proof that he has never before heard the doctrine or the narration which the preacher is enforcing? After this sermon, A. B. admits that there were *a thousand* confessions and communions in one church; and yet he would have us believe that few people frequent the sacraments.

We recommend the following to our Spanish readers:

"Not even the courtesy of Spaniards can make them behave decently to a priest! The priesthood in general seems to be thoroughly despised!"

Did this discoverer of mares' nests ever see the Queen of Spain meet a Spanish archbishop? But what can we expect from a person who could pen the following:

"I look upon Don F. as a good, honourable, *religious-minded* man, but *without religion*!"

The fact is, however, that it is all but hopeless to expect a candid account of any thing Catholic from those who are in the trammels of Protestantism. They *cannot* see, they *cannot* understand. A. B. gives the following extracts from a Spanish book of devotions to the Blessed Virgin:

"Of the Charity of Most Holy Mary."

"As the Eternal Father delivered his only-begotten Son to death in order to give life to men, so this admirable Mother of love delivered her only son Jesus to the rigours of death that all might be saved. She did not content herself with giving to the Divine Word flesh, wherein to suffer for men: she herself sacrificed Him. Standing at the foot of the Cross, whilst her Beloved immolated Himself for the salvation of mortals, she herself offered the sacrifice of this unspotted Victim, beseeching of the Eternal Father that He would receive it as a payment and satisfaction for all the sins of the world. She gave to men all that she could give, and she loved them more. She gave herself; and if she did not realise the sacrifice, it was because her offering had all the merit of which it was capable.

"Of the Righteousness of Most Holy Mary."

"It is well known, that Most Holy Mary, instead of being a debtor, gave so abundantly, that all remained and are her debtors: men for redemption; angels for their special joy; even the Most Holy Trinity are in a certain way a debtor to her for the accidental glory which has resulted and does result to them from this their Beloved.

"Of the Patience of Most Holy Mary."

"She suffered in Jesus, and with Jesus, as much as Jesus suffered.

"Of the Obedience of Most Holy Mary."

"She obeyed more than all creatures united, and by her obedience supplied the want of obedience of all the evil angels in heaven, and of all the ungrateful men on earth.

"Of the Religion of Most Holy Mary."

"Blind and deceived should we all have been, if Most Holy Mary, in her great mercy, had not given us in Jesus Christ the needful knowledge of the only, sole, and true religion. Though neither angels nor men had given, nor should give, to God the worship and veneration which they ought, Most Holy Mary would have fulfilled all the duties laid on every creature by the necessity of the virtue of religion. . . . Instructress of the Church, by whom and of whom the Apostles learnt to celebrate the mysteries of our redemption, to frequent the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to venerate the Holy Cross,

to pray, and exercise themselves in all the acts of religion, I adore thee!

"Of the Hope of Most Holy Mary.

"She herself was the object of the hope of the righteous; and scarcely did she shew herself in this world, when even as the shadows of the night begin to flee away before the coming of the dawn, so at the birth of Most Holy Mary, the Queen and Mother of Mercy, fled from many their doubts respecting the coming of the Messias. She herself was persuaded that He was at hand."

Will it be believed that the writer really appends to these extracts the following interpretation?

"In these extracts you will see that the office of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is attributed to her. *She sacrificed her Son for our salvation; we are redeemed by her sufferings; she was the teacher of the Apostles.*"

The brightest example of A. B.'s notions of historical authority is, however, to be found at p. 25, where a note to Lord Byron's *Beppo* is put forward as proof of the origin of a scandalous practice. Of course, our travellers are professedly astonished and shocked at some things which are both true and praiseworthy.

In one letter we read as follows:

"The Rector of the Seminary lent us a very nice book called the *Manual of the Seminarista*. It is a book giving a general sketch of the office and duties of priests, and the studies necessary for fulfilling them. I like almost all of it; but in the chapter on the Scriptures, the author says, that people in general, boys and women especially, whose natural simpleness is often mixed with ignorance and presumption, and leads them into heresies, must not have the Scriptures. They are the meat of the strong, and must be given in portions well spiced and seasoned. He quotes in evidence, 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' Where, he asks triumphantly, will you find it written, that faith cometh by reading, and reading by the holy books? Of course, with priests educated in these ideas, it will not be often that permission is given to read the Scriptures. And what a strange idea it gives one, to think that all the Scriptures of the Old Testament should have no existence to one's mind; that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, Samson, Ruth, all the pastoral scenes and all the scenes in the desert that have been pictured before one's mind from one's very earliest childhood, should never have been presented to it; that the patriarchs and saints of former days should be mixed up with modern Spanish saints, without any clear distinction of times or manners."

We need hardly say, that as to what was said in the "manual," we most heartily concur in it; thinking the entire Bible a very improper book to put into indiscriminate circula-

tion. What right have we to turn the word of God to a purpose for which its divine Author did not intend it? When it is shewn that it is the will of Almighty God that the Bible without any abridgment should be in the hands of women and children, and the ignorant of any age or either sex, we shall defer to the popular Protestant theory, but not till then. And in the mean time we should be glad to have A. B.'s and Mr. Meyrick's reply to the question put "triumphantly" by the author of the manual. But really what can be expected from a person who can gravely put on paper his opinion (as a self-evident truth), that because the Spanish common people do not read the Bible, *therefore* they know nothing of the history and personages of the Old Testament? Is our traveller serious when he says this? What does he conceive to be the condition of English Protestants *who cannot read*? What did they do for religious instruction among the Jews, under the apostles, or before the invention of printing? As has been said, Protestants *cannot* reason on Catholic subjects. Here again, on the very same page with this notable conception about the Old Testament, we have it stated, "People cannot imagine such a thing as female virtue." Yet even this writer dares not breathe a word against the nuns, and he lauds highly the Spanish ladies with whom he made acquaintancce. Why, we have heard the very same calumny frequently stated by Englishmen, and English gentlemen too, respecting very large numbers of their own Protestant countrywomen.

Such are our travelling critics. Will they be believed by their stay-at-home readers? Most undoubtedly. Nothing is so unscrupulous as even the most Puseyite Protestantism, when it would make good its case against the reasonings of Catholics. They believe the *Guardian* newspaper; why, then, not believe Messrs. Meyrick and Debary? Yet this same *Guardian* has recently had the effrontery to put forward and maintain the assertion that the early Christian Fathers did not hold that professed heretics were external to the true Church. We assure our readers that we are not jesting. This journal, the most influential of Puseyite publications, and displaying a degree of tact and ability far beyond the ordinary run of what are called religious newspapers, in its irritation against Mr. Ward for his pamphlet on the Anglican Church, has permitted itself to deny one of the most palpable facts which the whole range of history, secular or religious, presents. What can be done with such controversialists? Are we to begin with proving that St. Athanasius believed the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; that Tertullian was not Pope of Rome; that St. Paul was not one of the first twelve Apostles? We really

are tempted to admire the *Guardian* for the magnificence of its audacity. No doubt it was perfectly well aware that any thing against Rome would pass current for historical truth with its readers; and that whatever Mr. Ward might say in reply would be treated as non-existent; the very advertisements of Catholic publications not being generally admitted into the expurgated pages of that candid journal. The reply, indeed, is so powerful, that we cannot wonder at the timidity with which our opponents shrink from perusing it. We can give but a single extract, though the whole pamphlet abounds with facts of great significance, enforced with a most awkward pertinacity of logic.

“I am not, of course, endeavouring to lay down the principle on which the Fathers would pronounce this or that doctrine to be heresy. Nor again am I determining the question, for instance, how great a proof of *obstinacy* they would require, before dealing with an individual as a heretic. Nor yet am I in any way opposing myself to Father Perrone’s assertion (which indeed is evident enough on the very surface of history), that while many tenets on their first promulgation are perceived to be heretical, many others, on the contrary, are not so regarded before the Church has condemned them. I am merely saying, that from the moment (whenever it is) that this or that person is regarded as a professed heretic, from that precise moment, and as a part of the same judgment not separable in idea from the former, he is regarded as external to the Church.

“The first illustration I may bring forward, to bring home to your mind how deeply-seated and pervasive a principle of the Church this has ever been, will be the very meaning of the word ‘Catholic.’ Your own theologian Bull (if authority be wanting on so plain a matter) states, that this term began to be in universal use from the time of St. Polycarp. Now what is meant in ecclesiastical and primitive language by the word ‘Catholic?’ It means two things; an orthodox believer, and a member of the Catholic Church: therefore these two things are co-extensive. Take it another way. Will you maintain yourself, that any early Christian could have spoken of an *heretical Catholic*? Are not the two mutually contradictory? On the other hand, every member of the Catholic Church was a Catholic: this, again, you will not deny. But if every member of the Catholic Church was a Catholic; and no heretic was a Catholic; no heretic was a member of the Catholic Church. (*Camestres.*) Q.E.D. This is one of those many obvious marks which prove the identity of the Catholic Church in every age. Members of your party are compelled to speak of ‘Catholic-minded’ members of your Establishment, as opposed to ‘heretically-minded;’ or sometimes, more boldly, to speak of those who agree with you as *Catholics*, in contradistinction to those who do not; or occasionally even to make mention of the Catholic *party* in your body. But to call Dr. Hampden, *e. g. a*

Catholic, though he is a most undeniable member of your communion, is what your boldest champions have not ventured to do. Can any thing be in more preposterous opposition to the whole current of antiquity, than the idea that a branch of the Catholic Church can possess members who are not Catholics?

“Secondly, let me, following Bellarmine, allude to the habitual expression, in the early Fathers, of ‘coming from any heresy into the Church,’ as shewing how completely, as a matter of course, Church membership was considered as a state *inconsistent* with open heresy. In the controversy on heretical baptism, for instance, St. Stephen’s well-known judgment runs, ‘if any one come to us from *whaterer heresy*, &c.’ Indeed, I suppose it is hardly too much to say, that one cannot open a single treatise of any length, written by any one among the Fathers, without seeing some such opposition expressed between the Church and heresy. The Church on the one side; schism and heresy on the other side, as her two great and avowed enemies; such is the picture presented, in every detail which has come down to us of primitive times: schism, whereby the individual *separates himself*,—heresy, whereby he becomes *jure divino separate*,—from the visible body of Christ.

“Thirdly, the same truth is irresistibly impressed on us, the more we read of the treatment received by individual heresiarchs at the hands of the great doctors of the Church, who, as a matter of course, and indeed as the very symbol of their regarding them as heretics, avoided their communion, without so much as dreaming that any formal excommunication by authority was previously necessary. This fact is brought out most sharply, of course, in those instances where heretics were at once perceived to be such, previously to the Church’s judgment; because, in the contrary case, the same authority which condemned the heresy, proceeded at once to excommunicate its continued upholders. And yet even this latter class of cases has great force in the present argument, from the matter-of-course way in which the sentence of excommunication accompanies the judgment of heresy; not as being a further matter of deliberation, but as the natural and direct consequence of the former step. But let me speak of one or two instances from the other class of cases; which are to be considered, however, merely in the light of *samples*, which might be almost indefinitely multiplied, of a large whole.

“I begin with Paul of Samosata; and with the Synodical Letter of the Second Council of Antioch, which deposed him from his bishopric. This letter first mentions, that the bishops of the Council had begged St. Dionysius of Alexandria to be present with them; and that he, in return, addressed a letter to Antioch: but that as to Paul, ‘the originator of error,’ St. Dionysius ‘did not think him *worthy of so much as a salutation, nor of being personally addressed.*’ This, you observe, was prior to any excommunication or deposition. The Council presently proceeds, in reference to Paul’s wicked life: But since, *departing from the rule of faith*, he has moved over to spu-

rious and adulterate doctrine, of him [thus] *external* [to the Church] there is no need to examine the *actions*.' Having proceeded, however, to enlarge on his vices, the bishops proceed:

"But for these things, as we said before, any one might call in question a man who had a Catholic spirit, and *was numbered with ourselves*; but this man, who has *renounced the mystery* [of the faith], and has *fallen into the foul heresy* of Artemas of him we consider it is not necessary to ask account of these things Paul, therefore, *having fallen from his bishopric at the same time with* [his fall from] *his orthodoxy of faith*, Domnus has received the administration of the Church in Antioch,' &c.

"And this contrast between heresy and immorality, you will observe, is expressed at the very time when the penitential discipline of the Church existed in its fullest rigour."

Another specimen of Protestant candour has lately met our eyes in a journal of a very different complexion from the *Guardian*. The *Spectator* is the pre-eminently candid, philosophical, reasoning, unimpassioned periodical, of a generation which believes in nothing except its own critical acumen. When Father Newman delivered a series of lectures on "Anglican Difficulties," this paper was greatly struck with the force of his reasoning and the beauty of his style; and reviewed the lectures as fairly as could be expected from a Protestant. Now the case is altered. The lecturer has turned to the purely Protestant wing of the heretical army; and the journalist instantly changes his tone, and gravely condemns Father Newman for not writing a book in direct proof of the Catholic religion. He delivers a series of lectures on the Protestant view of Catholicism; and his reviewer is astonished that it does not turn out to be a book of dogmatic theology. To add to the absurdity, and to shew the dishonourable unfairness of mind which so warps our enemies, that they themselves hardly know what they are uttering, the critic actually quotes a passage in which he protests that Father Newman is putting off the expectant reader by saying, that to "enunciate the first principles of Catholicism" would be "impossible on such an occasion as this; it would be easier to write a book." (Even this quotation, though given with inverted commas, is not word for word with the original.) But what *did* the lecturer say would be thus impossible? To enter fully into the criticisms and judgments passed by Protestants! So far from apologising for not expounding the foundations of Catholic belief, the subject never crossed his mind. Yet the reviewer coolly treats the book as a failure, because it does not handle a matter which it never professed to touch upon. The instance is a trifling one; but it is worth noting as an example

of the fairness, the straightforwardness, and the accuracy of statement and reasoning, which we have to expect from the most reasonable and least exasperated of Protestants. Well indeed might Father Newman say in his preface (which we must conclude that the *Spectator* omitted to read), that he has a most profound misgiving about the fairness of the English people as judges of the evidences of Catholicism.

QUAKERISM.

Quakerism ; or the Story of my Life. By a Lady who for forty years was a Member of the Society of Friends. Dublin, Oldham

A Portraiture of the Christian Profession and Practice of the Society of Friends. By Thos. Clarkson, M.A. London, Gilpin.

WHOEVER may be the "Lady" who has given to the world the above-named record of her experiences as a Quaker, we cannot congratulate the community which she has now joined on the acquisition of their new convert. She is an Irishwoman, of a family uncommonly comfortably circumstanced in this world's goods, as she takes good care to inform us much oftener than once in the course of her reminiscences. By her own confession she abominated Quakerism from her childhood ; yet for forty years she remained in the community of her parents, and only left it when she was fairly expelled for long-continued and open contempt of its rules and discipline. Indeed, her only motive for wishing to remain in the Society seems to be a species of perverse determination not to give up her own way ; and we are only surprised that the people whom she had never loved, and had long unceasingly thwarted, suffered her to remain so long among them. She is now a member of the Establishment, of the mild Evangelical school, and has written a book to shew-up Quakerism and Quakers, marked by a very bitter spirit, and quite as discreditable to herself as to the "Friends" themselves.

Such being the "Lady's" history, we cannot help regarding her sketches as a somewhat unfair picture of that curious form of Paganism which delights in broad-brimmed hats and bad grammar. Even if her stories be genuine, yet probably the book is false by omission. A person who has never given a fair trial to the tenets of the persuasion in which he has

been educated, can never be accepted as a perfectly satisfactory exponent of their nature and influence, so far as his personal experience goes. And when a woman can go on for forty years, in heart a rebel against the system which she professes to uphold, we confess that we look upon her testimony with very great suspicion.

As to the stories themselves which make up the staple of her book, they may be individually true nevertheless. Unquestionably, if they are not true, the authoress has a very decided genius for comedy and farce; for any thing more ludicrous than the portraiture of Quakerism which is here offered to us, we can hardly conceive. The "Lady," too, tells them with such exquisite *gusto*, and puts every thing so cleverly into its most absurd light, that we suspect the "Friends" were never before made to look so inconceivably silly, or the hollowness of their system more cruelly laid bare.

Those who would contrast the ex-Quakeress's pictures with the professions of the Society, as stated by one of their ablest advocates, may consult Mr. Clarkson's *Portraiture*. It is not a new book, but is advertised by the publishers as a reply to the "Lady's" attacks. Its author never was a Quaker himself, but he saw a good deal of the Quakers during his efforts to put down the slave-trade; and he wrote the present volume as an exposition of their views and of the grounds on which they defend them. In fact, he writes almost as a Quaker, and his work is curious enough. Perhaps we shall not be far wrong if we say, that a tolerably correct notion of Quakerism, as it is in fact, may be gained from a perusal of the two books together. Our business at present is with the ex-Quakeress's story; but we think it only just to refer those who would form any decisive opinion as to the "Friends," to the elaborate volume of their admirer and apologist.

We should premise also, that we have strong ground for doubting the strict veracity, or at least the accuracy, of the ex-Quakeress, from one or two stories which she tells of what she saw in Catholic chapels in Ireland. One of these, a laughably monstrous tale about what took place on All Souls' day, is manifestly what is vulgarly called a "cram." The "Lady's" servant, a frolicsome Hibernian, could not resist the temptation to astonish the Quakeress, and he certainly did invent an anecdote which might have been expected to be too much even for Protestant credulity. Our authoress, however, seems never to have suspected her informant; and here we have at full length, as an historical fact, the following delightful *morceau*:

"We were in Cork on All Souls' day; and my mother, accompanied by some of her friends, went in the evening to the Roman

Catholic Cathedral, having heard that there would be there a curious exhibition of the efficacy of prayers for the dead. She told me that on going in, the chapel was dazzlingly light. Wax candles three feet high blazed upon the altar; and every one of the numerous priests in attendance carried in his hand a lighted taper. One of them gave an oration or sermon on the inestimable value of masses for the souls in purgatory; and assured his hearers that that very evening they should behold the souls of their own dead ancestors; who, having spent years in torment, were now, thanks to the masses offered up in that chapel, emancipated from their misery, and going to enter into the regions of glory. When he ceased speaking, the prayers for the dead were chaunted. The lights gradually went out, until the whole chapel and its vast congregation were in total darkness; then a sickly glare was visible around the altar; and in that dim light was distinctly seen a number of small, bright-red, queer-looking objects, passing over it. One of the priests, as if in an ecstasy, then gave thanks for the answer to his prayers; and called on the people to be no longer faithless, but believing, as they now saw with their own eyes that souls were indeed released from purgatory by the prayers of the Church. This curious exhibition interested me greatly; and we were all guessing and puzzling ourselves to understand it, but in vain. However, before leaving Cork, my mother went to pay a visit to her old nurse, and took me with her. The old woman was delighted to see her foster-child; and called her, as of old, 'my own dear Miss Mary.' They chatted together for a long time, giving each other intelligence of their different families. At last my mother asked for James, her own foster-brother. Nurse said he was well, and had now got a fine situation. He was clerk to the priest. Whilst speaking of him, James came in. A nice-looking man, with an eye beaming with fun and good humour. He was most cordial in his welcome; and my mother, with her usual tact, set him at his ease. In a few moments he joined in the conversation; but I forget all they said, except one part, that no one could ever forget that heard it. My mother told them of her visit to the chapel, and of the queer things she had seen crawling over the altar; and she asked James what they were? 'The souls to be sure, ma'am,' said James. But my mother laughed, and said surely he knew she was only a heretic; and he might gratify her, by telling what they really were. 'Indeed, then,' said James, 'when you were a child, like myself, I never could refuse you any thing; and I am sure I won't begin to deny you now; and besides, as you say, you are a heretic; and I wish I had half as good a chance of heaven, for all that, as you have; but, at any rate, there is no chance of the priest ever knowing that I told you; so you may as well hear it. It was I myself that got them for him; I got all the crabs I could lay my hands on, for love or money; and Father Kelly and I put the little red cloth jackets on them; and we had a thread fastened to every one of them, if they did not chose to walk right, to make them. And you know it was so dark, you could not see much about it; and now, ma'am dear, was it not a capital clever delusion for the poor ignorant creatures that believe every thing?'"

Considering that the "Lady" tells us she saw the Christmas *Presepio*, or cradle, on *Good Friday*, in the Chapel of the Presentation nuns, we shall know how far to credit her assertion of what she *saw* in the Cathedral of Cork. She really puts to shame the "Scripture Reader" at Benediction in the London Oratory.

The Quakers themselves, if our authoress is to be believed, have notions on religious worship even more astonishing than those popularly attributed to them. Here is an instance. "Sister Betsy" was the mistress of the school where our authoress was sent for education :

"Another thing disturbed these righteous girls, as Sister Betsy once called them to me; that was, that before getting into bed, I knelt to repeat the Lord's Prayer, as my mother had ever taught me to do. There was not one of all the forty girls but myself, had been so habituated. Eliza and Anne remonstrated with me on this, which they called a Popish practice; and because I paid no regard to their preachings, they then went and told Sister Betsy, and she forbid me to kneel. She said, 'it was too solemn an act for any one but an appointed minister of our Society, and wholly unbecoming in one so far from righteousness as I was.'"

But if Quaker notions on private praying are odd enough, the incidents here sketched as taking place at their public meetings are quite in keeping. There seems to be a very considerable amount of dinner-giving and dinner-eating going on at the periodical gatherings of the sect in their chief haunts; and now and then the formalities of Quaker breeding come out most ludicrously. Here is one such instance :

"Our quarterly-meeting parties were often very amusing. I was invited to a large first-day dinner, at which I met, amongst others, five sisters. They were aged from about twenty-five to seventeen, all well-looking; the youngest quite handsome. They were all dressed exactly alike, in dark greenish tabinets, muslin kerchief, platted over the dress, and muslin mob caps. The eldest had been a constant attendant of these meetings; the four others were now brought out for the first time. They had been desired, when leaving home, to behave like Anne, the eldest; to do whatever she did, to copy her. The dinner provided for us was at the head of the table; a fine large loin of roast veal, with force-meats, &c. At the foot was a cold joint of roast beef. At one side a ham; at the other boiled chickens, and vegetables in variety. The sisters ranged themselves according to their ages at one side. Friend Tench, the hostess, addressing one of the younger ones, asked—'Jane, may I help thee to some roast veal?' She glanced at Anne, looked timid, and then said, 'Oh! I'm obliged to thee, not yet; I'll wait a bit.' Friend Tench then addressed another—'Susanna, may I help thee?' 'I'll wait a bit too, if thee please,' said Susanna. Friend Tench tried again.

‘Rebecca, will thee have some veal?’ ‘I’ll wait a bit, too, if thee please,’ said Rebecca. Friend Tench did not know what to make of it; but she tried again, and addressed the eldest. ‘Anne, what will thee take?’ ‘I’ll take some cold roast beef; I like cold meat on first days,’ said Anne. She was helped. And then, again, Jane, and Susanna, and Rebecca, and Martha were asked, and each one answered in the same words as Anne—‘I’ll take some cold roast beef, if thee please. I like cold meat on first days.’ They were all helped, and presently Anne handed up the plate, and said, ‘Will thee give me a little of that nice gravy, and a bit of force-meat?’ She got it, and up came the other plates, one after another, in their regular ages, from the other four; and each saying—‘Will thee give me a little of that nice gravy, and a bit of force-meat?’ It was difficult to maintain due gravity. In fact, the effort to do so was painful; and when the second course was placed on the table, and ‘I’ll take some rice pudding, if thee please; I’m very fond of rice pudding,’ was again echoed and re-echoed by the sisters, there was more than one of the company obliged to leave the room, not to annoy Friends by the *mal-à-propos* fit of coughing which seized them.”

Quaker notions of the “ministry” are of course sufficiently peculiar, even when not caricatured by the eccentricities of the “ministers” themselves. These ministers are of both sexes, and some of the most celebrated are of the gentler race. Now and then one of the greater lights, whether male or female, travels about to various quarterly meetings in different parts. What will be thought of such an apostle-errant as we have here pictured? He came from America, and was, it must not be forgotten, six feet four inches high, large-boned, and coarse-looking in the extreme; and he wore a great, shapeless, white cloth-coat, lined with light green. “Friend Flannil,” as he was named, was received by the father and mother of our authoress; and here he is on the evening of his arrival:

“A smothered laugh induced the speakers to look round. Friend Flannil had drawn his chair close to the fire; he had taken off his mocassins; and the view of his very tattered, dirty stockings, accounted for the laugh. We all became silent, watching what he was going to do. The trowsers were drawn up to the knees, (there were several ladies in the room, our usual quarterly-meeting guests,) a curious garter, made of the bark of a tree and twine, was thrown down on the rug, and the stockings deliberately taken off, exhibiting to our wondering eyes two of the very dirtiest and biggest feet I had ever beheld. Friend Flannil, perfectly regardless of the presence of any one, held up his feet alternately to the fire, warming and rubbing them, and grumbling that the fire was no good; because it was made of coal, instead of wood, as he said it ought to be. When the feet were warmed, and rubbed enough, he began to look about him, and to talk. ‘Do you call this living in the country? I am sure I don’t.’

Then to my father—‘Art thou married? Are these all thy children?’ ‘Oh! no,’ he replied; (some of the company were as old, and older than himself;) ‘these young ones here are mine.’ ‘Eugh!’ said Friend Flannil, ‘they are very puny. I have three sons, and the lowest of them is six feet three; I guess thou can’t match that.’ An irrepressible laugh ran round the room, and poor papa looked miserable, fearing the stranger would be offended; but Friend Haldwell whispered, ‘Do not be uneasy; he will never imagine it possible any one would laugh at him.’ Dinner being announced, a considerable delay took place putting on the old stockings, &c. &c. He was invited to go into another room to wash his hands; but positively refused. ‘What shall we do with him?’ asked my mother of Friend Haldwell. ‘Really,’ said he, ‘I do not know; but do what thou wilt, he never thinks of taking offence.’ She then ordered a basin of water, &c. into the room before us all, and said to him—‘Dinner is waiting, and thy hands must be washed; pray be quick.’ ‘Eugh!’ said he, ‘how mighty particular thou art!’ However, the ablutions were performed in a kind of way, and then he was requested to walk into the dining-room. He sat still, and looked about; and seeing the butler standing at the door, he called out—‘Here, thee, man! bring in the dinner, then, can’t thee, if it is ready.’ With a great deal of difficulty he was induced to go into the dining-room, which at last he did, by running past every one. He was placed at my mother’s left hand at table, and the rest of us, twenty-two in number, took our places. Scarce were we seated, when Friend Flannil’s tall, awkward form rose; he grasped the saltcellar, stretched it half way down the table, and threw it all about. He said, ‘I hate them buckets of salt. Mother, never put one near me again; mind, I hate salt.’ He occasionally used his knife and fork, but much more frequently his fingers. He called for coffee, which not being ready, he said, ‘Go, get it; I’ll wait for it:’ and he went over to the fire until it was prepared. Then he came back to his seat, and ate fish in his fingers, and drank coffee, scolding and growling incessantly, and ordering ‘the mother’ to go get him one thing or another. After dinner, Jane Dalton came in to pay her respects to the American Friend, and to invite him to dine with her mother on first day. She approached him almost with reverence, as a superior being. She said, ‘My mother, Mary Dalton—thou hast probably heard her name—sent me to see thee, and to invite thee to dine with us to-morrow, between meetings. She would wish to become acquainted with thee.’ ‘Eugh!’ said Friend Flannil; ‘I don’t know her, or thee either; nor do I want to know her; and thee may go back and tell her that; and I’ll not go dine with her; I’ll stay with ‘the mother.’ Thee may go.’ Poor Jane!—such a rebuff; from the American Friend too; so many present—the ill-concealed laughter—the gaping, grinning servants—my father’s look of agony—for he was pained to the heart to see ‘an inspired minister’ so rude to a female. It was a most amusing scene; and was ended by my mother most peremptorily desiring Friend Flannil to speak politely; the Friends in Ireland must be treated courteously.

He tried to run out of the room ; but she insisted that he should sit down and listen to her. She told him it was very kind of Jane to ask him, and that he must accept her invitation. ‘ Well,’ said he, ‘ I will, if thou bids me.’ The evening wore away ; he called for meat at tea, and eat slice after slice of cold roast beef in his fingers, as another person would bread and butter : and when going to bed, said he must have something to eat in the night. He ordered the parlour fire to be kept lighted, and a tray with bread and cheese and porter to be left for him. After laughing more than we ever laughed in one day before, we all retired. * * *

“ The American disdained to use a spoon eating eggs ; and altogether his manners were so revolting, that it was unanimously determined henceforth he should take his meals at a table by himself ; my mother persuading him that it was her Irish manner of especially honouring an American guest.”

The sermon from this extraordinary evangelist was quite on a par with his manners :

“ We all went to meeting, and there Friend Flannil astonished all the assembly with his sermon. After the usual long pause of a Friends’ meeting, his huge gaunt form was seen to rise in the gallery, and to shake itself. Then the queer hat was taken off and laid on the ground, the coat unbuttoned, and he began in a voice loud and gruff. ‘ There was once an old horse, and he had a sore leg.’ This strange text drew all eyes on the man. He enlarged for nearly an hour on it with great volubility ; described the appearances as only one could have done who had witnessed the symptoms and treatment of veterinary disease ; and drew a kind of moral from it, that we were all as diseased as the old horse, as disgusting as the horrid picture he had drawn, and that Quakerism was the only cure. Of course, many comments were made on such a sermon as this, although Friends are often told it is very wrong to make any remark on addresses which are considered to proceed from ‘ immediate inspiration :’ but this induced many to disregard the general rule. One said ‘ it was a wonderfully deep discourse.’ Another, ‘ that it contained a deal of hidden meaning.’ Another, ‘ that we must be as far advanced ourselves in Christian experience to be able to understand it.’ Another, ‘ that it was scandalous to hear such language in a place of worship.’ And another, ‘ for my part, I think the man is mad.’ I believe very many agreed in this last opinion, but were timid of saying so. After meeting, he went to dine with Mary Dalton ; and we had a very large company dining with us, and were amusing ourselves talking of, and laughing at, the strange American minister. Whilst we were in the middle of dinner, however, in walked Flannil, with greatcoat and hat on. We asked him ‘ was any thing the matter, that he had left Mary Dalton’s so soon ?’ He said, ‘ Yes : I don’t like her ; she is so fat ; and her house has a wall opposite to it, and I like to see something green.’ We asked had he dined ? Yes : I eat a bit, and then I came away.’ ‘ Did Mary Dalton know he was going away ?’ ‘ No ;

she looked so fat ; I only said I was going out for a minute.' ' But that was rude.' ' Well, I don't care.' Presently after, came a young man up the lawn looking after him. He told us that Flannil had snatched the leg of a turkey up in his fingers, and gobbled it up before any one at the table was helped, and then ran out of the house, actually frightening the good Friends.

" The next day at dinner we had another scene. He was as usual placed at a small side-table by himself, but near my mother. We were all eating, and enjoying ourselves, when suddenly he exclaimed in a loud unearthly voice, that made the knives and forks drop out of our hands—' Something is going to happen.' Poor mamma turned pale ; the servants stood aghast, and wonder sat on each countenance. We asked—' What, what is the matter ?' He slowly replied, ' Something dreadful ; oh ! dreadful !' After what seemed a long time of painful suspense, he said, ' I feel all down my leg and foot, like pins and needles pricking me.' ' Oh !' said one of my brothers, ' the man's foot is asleep—that's all.' And such a fit of laughter followed, as was, I am sure, never before heard at a quarterly-meeting dinner-party ; even poor papa laughed in spite of himself, and never from that day out, even tried to persuade us to respect this man, who was sent from America with the sanction and approval, by letters and epistles, of three yearly meetings there, to preach in this country as an inspired minister of the Christian religion—who was forwarded to Ireland from England, with the full approbation of the English meetings ; and again sent from Dublin down to the South, as something far more holy than common. In the evenings he would lie on the sofa, full length, and scold any one who came near him ; calling old ladies ' child,' bidding them ' get away'—' young woman, thy breath is not sweet' to one ; and when tea was handed round, he addressed one nice English friend, with—' Here thee, go get me some meat.' She went, and brought him some slices of cold meat. He turned them over and over again with his fingers, dashed his tea awkwardly over her nice silk dress, and then scolded her heartily, and greased her with his hands, in the most outrageously rude manner. And yet the plain friends, many of whom were present, still looked on him as a holy man, and coveted a word, even a cross word, from him."

It seems that it is a part of Quaker discipline to send " overseers" to overhaul the members of any family which oversteps the limits of Quaker puritanism. Think of a domiciliary visit like this :

" We had a visit from the two women overseers of our meeting, to remonstrate on the impropriety of having a drawing-master. They said they would not think of bringing us before the meeting for it, but it was a relief to their own minds to speak to us on the matter ; and they hoped we would weigh it well, and remember, that it was in much love they had spoken. Another time, the overseers came to say, that they had heard of our having a French master ; that they knew it was not generally objected to by Friends, but they felt easier to warn

us. There was great danger in it ; it was insidious ; Friends were tempted to say things in French they would not say in English—such as Monsieur and Madame. They did not wish to be officious, and they hoped we would not think them officious ; but their office was a very important one, and they were anxious to fulfil their duty faithfully.”

By and by our “ Lady” married an English Quaker living at Bristol ; and she gives many amusing sketches of her reception among the “ Friends” there. One of the most curious is the story of the devices by which Quakers sometimes accommodate their consciences on the score of tithe-paying.

“ Soon after becoming a housekeeper,” she says, “ I was called on by the tithe-collector. Friends annually sum up the amount of all they have lost by this suffering, as they call it ; and I was then under the idea that ‘ our noble testimony against an hireling ministry’ was an essential part of all true Christianity, and that our refusal to pay the unholy tax was an acceptable martyrdom in a small way. I had heard much preaching on the subject, and very much self-laudation on the faithfulness of the Society generally, indeed universally, to this our testimony, which so widely separated us from the hirelings of all other creeds. The two men who called on me for the purpose of collecting the disputed impost were exceedingly gentle and polite. They saw at a glance that I was an ignoramus, and kindly volunteered to inform me how other Quakers managed, for I had told them that my profession would not allow me to pay tithes ; and that if they insisted on forcibly taking away my property, though I would not resist, still I would look on it as actual robbery. ‘ Did you ever pay tithes, ma’am ?’ said one of the men. ‘ Never,’ I replied. ‘ Well, then,’ said he, ‘ you are a stranger here, I see, and I’ll just tell you how the Bristol Quakers manage, for I am going about among them for twenty years past, and I am always glad to accommodate them, and meet their scruples. The sum you must pay is one guinea ; so I will call here to-morrow, at eleven o’clock in the morning, and you just leave on the sideboard there some articles of plate—your tea-pot will do very well, or spoons, or whatever you like ; then I come and take it away. You don’t give it, and so your conscience is clear. You will then return to your meeting-people, that your tea-pot, worth ten guineas, was distrained for tithe ; and as soon after as you like, you can go to Mr. Jones, the silversmith, and tell him how you lost your tea-pot, and are obliged to buy a new one. He will condole with you ; and after shewing you a variety of new ones to select from, he will hand you your own identical article, and say, he can sell you that cheap—say one guinea. You pay your guinea, and get your own safe back again, cleaner and brighter than ever ; and, if you like, you can purchase some other little trifling article ; for Mr. Jones is a very accommodating man.’ I was really shocked at the cool proposal of so nefarious and unprincipled a transaction, and indignantly rejected it ; declaring, at the same time, my firm belief, that no Quaker would be guilty of so undignified and false an act. The

man smiled, and said, 'Ay, that is the way they all go on at first ; but, ma'am, it is a great deal the easiest and best plan in the end ;' and then he gave me the names of very many, my own acquaintances, who regularly once a year, as he jocularly said, 'allowed Mr. Jones to clean their plate.' 'There is old Mr. R.' said he, 'has a fine massive silver tea-pot. It is always laid out ready for me ; I always give notice before I go ; and now, twenty times I have carried it off, and got it brightened for him. He values it at twenty pounds, and his tithe is only one pound ten. And there is young Mr. R. He likes me to get his spoons done for him. He gives so many dinners, he likes to have them bright and new-looking.' Seeing me still very credulous, he said, 'Well, ma'am, I won't call on you for a week, to give you time to think of the matter.' During that week I went to old Mr. R.'s, and told his daughter that tithes had been demanded of me, but that I had not paid them, and was expecting another visit from the collector. 'Oh ! yes,' said she, 'this is just the time they go about. They seized a valuable silver tea-pot from us last week. My father values it at twenty guineas, and the demand in money is only thirty shillings ; but it is a noble testimony we are called on to bear ; and I trust our faithfulness will yet be the means of opening the eyes of professing Christians to the nature of a pure, free, gospel ministry. I trust, my young Friend, thou wilt be faithful.' She spoke so seriously, that I hesitated to say what I intended about Jones's shop, lest the idea that I for a moment could think her or her father capable of such a deed might offend. I then called on Mrs. R., and mentioned the same thing to her. 'They did indeed,' said she, 'take our spoons ; but my William has some way or other to get them back. I can't tell how he manages ; but I suppose they are ashamed of taking so much over their demand, and so return them. At any rate, they are sent back beautifully polished ; and not only that, but a handsome sugar-spoon, with our crest engraved on it, was also amongst them. I suppose they were sorry, and put in the spoon by way of atonement.' I suspected that my Friend William might know more than his wife on the subject, but said nothing. I then went to Jones's shop, and boldly asked, if they would return me articles of plate which might be distrained for tithe, on paying the exact amount of tithe demanded, and was politely informed, that they would be most happy to do so—to enter into the same arrangement with me as with other Quakers. 'But,' said I, 'what recompense will you require for affording me so great an accommodation ?' 'None whatever,' replied the shopkeeper ; 'the Friends are very good customers of ours ; we are always glad to see them entering our doors.' 'And what must I pay the collectors ?' 'They make no charge either ; you can give them an odd shilling now and then if you like ; for they are very honest, civil fellows.' Faithful to their appointment, at the end of the week the men came to me, walked straight into the parlour, and over to the sideboard, and looked disappointed not to find the plate ready laid out for them. I told them I had to apologise for doubting their veracity. I had inquired, and

found that their statement was true ; but as I could not see any sense in such a roundabout way of paying, I thought it simpler, and came to the same thing in the end, to pay the money at once, which I did. They thanked me, and broadly grinning, said, ' I was the only Quaker in Bristol who did the thing in a straightforward manner, as most of the Society had a crank in their consciences about it.' * * *

"The Irish Friends are quite as clever in a different way. Thus a sack of wheat was once placed in a very conspicuous position in a barn, when it was known the tithe-collectors were coming to distrain. The owner stood by, and said to them, ' Look at that sack of wheat ; I would not for five pounds seven and sixpence lose that.' Five pounds seven and sixpence was the exact sum demanded. The men immediately lifted it up on the car they had brought with them, and drove off a little beyond the end of the avenue ; they then turned back again. The Quaker had not moved from the spot he stood in. They said, ' Sir, will you buy a fine sack of wheat from us ? ' ' What is the price ? ' asked Broadbrim ; ' let me look at it.' He opened the sack, rubbed the grain in his hand, and said it was very prime. ' Come, sir, be quick ; will you buy it for five pounds seven and sixpence ? ' ' Yes,' he replied, ' I will,' and drew the amount out of his pocket. The sack was restored to its proper place. The collectors received an extra shilling, with which to drink the Friend's health, and very likely to laugh heartily at that curious anomaly, a Quaker's conscience. A gentleman who has now left the Friends, and joined the Church of England and Ireland, told me that when he was a Quaker, his plan of evading the payment, and supporting the testimony was, to leave, as if by chance, cartridges of half-pence rolled up in papers to a larger amount than the sum demanded, in a conspicuous place. The collectors would only take the right sum, and the testimony was upheld most satisfactorily."

Quaker interpretations of Scripture are, as may be supposed, unique in the history of Biblical exegesis ; but the following we should think unparalleled :

" I was speaking to an elderly Friend on the subject of women's preaching, and said, ' I cannot understand how our Friends explain away that fourteenth chapter of I Cor. ; the command is so positive, and so solemnly enforced.' She replied, ' Ah ! my dear, sure thee knows St. Paul was a bachelor ; no one could expect that he would be very polite to the females.' "

One would have treated this notion about St. Paul as incredible, but for such passages as the subjoined from Clarkson's *Portraiture*, which is given with the gravest seriousness, among other " reasons" for the abolition of baptism :

" Though Philip is said to have baptised, yet he left no writings behind him, like the former"—St. Peter and St. Paul ;—" nor are so many circumstances recorded of him by which Friends may be enabled to judge of his character, or to know what his opinions ultimately were on that subject."

With such ideas of revelation, it is not to be wondered that the meetings of "gentlemanly" Quakerism are sometimes like the following :

" Travelling through South Wales, we were told one Sabbath morning that there was a Friends' meeting held in the house of a Friend, and that it was according to law, a registered place of worship. We resolved to attend it, and went there ; it was a gentleman's comfortable house, surrounded by a small well-kept lawn and gardens. The owner, his wife, and brother, constituted the usual assembly. We were cordially welcomed at the door, as an acceptable addition to the meeting. The drawing-room, a very elegant apartment, light, cheerful, and decorated with numerous articles of taste and vertu, was the meeting-room. The lady retired for a few moments, and returned with her Friend's bonnet and shawl on, her husband then slipped down stairs, and came back with his hat on. Then we all sat down, and 'dropped into silence.' It had not continued five minutes, when the owner of the house got fidgetty, and jumping up, said, 'I do not think we can manage a silent meeting well. Shall I read a chapter in the Bible?' We all assented, and he laid on the beautifully inlaid table a magnificent copy of the Holy Scriptures, from which he read two chapters and a psalm ; a two-minutes' pause succeeded, and then he turned round on his chair, and gravely shook hands with me. Meeting was over, and we began to chat ; he insisted we should remain and dine with him, as he said Friends always did when they attended that meeting. And his wife proposed a walk, which we all enjoyed very much ; the day was fine, and the scenery quite new to me ; the mountain-air invigorating, and our companions intelligent and exceedingly agreeable. The lady laughingly told me that she always put on her bonnet, and her husband his hat, when sitting in their drawing-room—their make-believe meeting-house, on first-days—'but,' said she, 'it would not feel like a Friends' meeting unless we had on those appendages of our Society.' She told me that 'her husband had subscribed several hundred pounds for the building of a large church, which was quite near them ; that she often thought it would be more sensible to go there to worship ; that the minister was a valued friend of theirs, and that they could not see any thing wrong in the service of the Church ; but that, as it would expose them to so much annoyance from the Society, they kept on the old way ; sitting silent first with hat and bonnet on, for the name of the thing, and then reading the Bible for edification.' "

Besides abundance of other stories of a similar complexion, the ex-Quakeress makes other and still heavier charges against her former associates ; whether they are true or not, we cannot say. In her preface she positively asserts the rigorous truth of her whole book, and protests that if "Friends" assert that she has even coloured her pictures too highly, she will publish

her own name, with the exact names of all parties concerned, with the place and time of each circumstance. Whether they will venture to call on her to fulfil her threat time will shew.

SHORT NOTICES.

Dr. Pagani's *Life of Dr. Gentili* (Richardsons) is one of the most interesting books which has for some time past issued from the English Catholic press. The memory of Dr. Gentili will long be held in grateful and affectionate remembrance, in connexion with the present eventful epoch in the history of Catholicism in England. So rapid, indeed, have been the changes which have taken place in certain details of our religious practices, that it is already difficult to believe that to Dr. Gentili is owing the first regular introduction of public spiritual retreats in our great towns and cities. For the same reason also, it is not easy to estimate the precise degree of general influence which the presence and labours of Dr. Gentili exercised amongst us. Whatever, however, be the precise judgment of the future historian, it is certain that a most distinguished position in the missionary band must be ever assigned to the subject of this memoir.

Dr. Pagani has executed his task—by no means an easy one—with much judgment and skill, and has succeeded in presenting a life-like portrait, not a little attractive. His work is a biography, and not an indiscriminate eulogy; and few readers will rise from it without a warm admiration and hearty respect for the singular genuineness and single-mindedness of Father Gentili, and a deep veneration for him as a Christian and a missionary priest. The specimens which are given of his powers as a spiritual guide, in a short selection from his letters, will bear comparison with the writings of some of the most celebrated of ascetic authors. The biographer may be further congratulated on his free and idiomatic use of the English language, barring some occasional blemishes, which might easily be corrected in a second edition. We should also suggest the omission of the greater number of the letters and “testimonials,” as the biographer terms them, which are printed at the termination of the volume.

The Catholic Florist (Richardsons) is a little work at once graceful and religious in idea, and satisfactory in execution. It furnishes a large variety of hints for the cultivation and use of flowers for the altar and other Catholic purposes, illustrated with a copious and well-chosen selection of verses. For the sake of its author, and for its own merits, we shall be glad to see it in extensive circulation. An interesting preface is prefixed by Mr. Oakeley, bringing out the Christian uses of flowers with his accustomed delicacy of perception and happiness of style. The popular “Protestantising” of the names

of many flowers, Mr. Oakeley has, however, somewhat exaggerated. From a list he gives of old Catholic names, which he believes to be now abolished, we could name several with which we have been familiar in the mouths of Protestants for the last five and twenty or thirty years. The change, we suspect, has been quite as much through the prevailing taste for *Latin* names as from an anti-Catholic spirit; as we heard the other day of a country clown near an agricultural college in Gloucestershire saying to a stranger, "We used to call this here Flint, but now we calls it *Zoilex*" (*Silex*).

The first volume of a translation of Didron's *Christian Iconography* has appeared in one of Mr. Bohn's now numerous "libraries," with faithful transcripts of the many illustrations of the original work. The book is curious and instructive in a high degree, and exhibits the history of Christian art as an expression of religious doctrine and feeling, from the earliest times till the sixteenth century. The author's acquirements are far above those of ordinary artistic and ecclesiological antiquarians, and his knowledge of the particular branch of religious history (for so it may certainly be called) of which he treats is wonderfully extensive. We do not, of course, pledge ourselves to an agreement with all his views; but the book may be strongly recommended as of very great value, and full of interesting information even to the general reader. The cuts are well executed, and the price moderate. The whole will be completed in two volumes.

Cecile; or, the Pervert, by the author of "Rockingham" (Colburn), is a clever one-volume novel, shewing up the absurdities of the late "papal aggression" furor. The author possesses considerable skill in the delicate delineation of character, and there is hardly a personage in his story who is not, as we say, well done. Cecile herself, a Catholic, is made, it is true, to talk occasionally not a little nonsense by way of Catholic doctrine; but with this drawback, the story is as lively and truthful a sketch as ordinary fiction usually presents. Its fault lies in the conduct of its conclusion, which is huddled up in a most hasty and awkward fashion.

Whoever may be the author of *The Excellence of Melody* and *The Music of the Ancients* (Richardsons), he manifestly knows more of the *idea* of music than of the reality. His pamphlet is a collection of scraps from old and out-of-the-way authors, and his moral is, that it is immoral to sing in parts.

The translation of *Father Seraphin's Reflections on the Passion* (Dolman) will be acceptable to many of our readers. The author is one of the most distinguished Italian Fathers of the Apostolical Passionists, and his meditations have attained a well-deserved popularity in his own country. They form a complete series of subjects for daily use, characterised by that devout love for our Blessed Lord, and reverent study of the every detail of His adorable sufferings, which is the Christian's greatest happiness.

Miss Agnes Stewart, a lady already favourably known as the author of several Catholic tales, has published, partly by subscription, a set of stories on the Sacraments, under the title of *The Seven Lights of the Sanctuary* (Richardsons). They will add to her previous reputation; and we trust she may find their sale fully adequate to their merits. A few particulars of Miss Stewart's history some time ago appeared in the *Tablet*, and those who remember them will gladly join with us in recommending her little volume to their friends.

Mamma's Stories (Richardsons) are a series of stories from the Bible, for very young children. They are well told, and will be found very useful.

We are glad to see a well-executed translation of Fenelon's admirable *Sacred Reflections for Every Day of the Month*, with other meditations, &c., by a Priest of the Institute of Charity (Richardsons); and trust that the translator may be encouraged to fulfil the intention he expresses of publishing a further and larger selection from Fenelon's correspondence.

Mr. Langdon's translation of Father Lacordaire's celebrated *Conferences in the Cathedral of Notre Dame* (Richardsons) will form three handsome volumes. Their rare merit is well known.

We call the attention of our readers to Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*, or Encyclopædia of Catholic theology and its auxiliary sciences, seventy-six numbers of which have reached us. The contributors, being upwards of a hundred in number, include almost all the most distinguished German Catholic theologians. It has the approbation of the Archbishop of Freiburg, Breisgau, where it is published, and is to be finished in eight volumes octavo. The present is really a second edition; and as it only commenced in 1850, there is every reason to expect it will be speedily completed. Its articles have all the writers' names affixed, and appear to us, where we have consulted them, to combine sound theology with a critical spirit. The matter is compressed, the type and paper good; and the whole work appears likely to be acceptable—to the student for its references, as well as to the general reader for its convenient arrangement.

Two more excellent Tracts, *The Religion of Catholics the Worship of Jesus*, and *Devotion to Saints and Angels*, have been added to the Clifton Tracts.

Mr. Dalton's Translation of *St. Teresa's Life of herself* (Dolman), and Mr. Morris's learned treatise *On the Incarnation* (Toovey), must be reserved for future notice.

Ecclesiastical Register.

DECREE

OF THE BEATIFICATION OR DECLARATION OF THE MARTYRDOM OF
THE VEN. SERVANT OF GOD JOHN DE BRITTO, PRIEST PROFESSED
OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

[Translation.]

THE Society of Jesus having been particularly destined by its holy founder to go through the entire world, and to preach the Gospel to every creature, it is to fulfil this mission that its children straitly bind themselves by their fourth vow, devoting themselves to confess the Son of Man before men, and surrendering even their life among the infidels, in order to gain those wretched beings to Jesus Christ, after having delivered them from their blindness, and thus to beget new sons unto his Church. Among these heroes of the first-fruits of the martyrs offered to God by the Society among the Japanese nations, the Ven. John de Britto made himself justly remarkable, who was born at Lisbon of an illustrious race, and was admitted in his early youth among the pages of Pedro II., King of Portugal.

But the pious education which he had received, and the integrity of his manners, speedily induced him to retire from the court, and, by way of prelude to the science of the saints, having scarcely reached the age of fifteen years, he entered into the Company of Jesus. He had not yet been promoted to the priesthood; but he was already ripe for the sacred ministry, when, burning with a desire of participating in the mission of the Indies, and happily fulfilling all the conditions required for that work, he was sent into the province of Malabar, to Madura, a holy expedition so fruitful in labours and in sufferings of every kind. There, this evangelical labourer, after having, during thirteen years, converted numerous idolaters, and baptised thousands of persons, found, by the orders of the Rajah of Madura, a hard captivity, which he bore with an incredible constancy of soul, thereafter to endure frightful torture and banishment. He then returned into Europe by order of his superiors.

He there accomplished with great energy all with which he had been charged for the needs of those missions, and hastened to return to Malabar, where he resumed his apostolical labours with an increase of zeal. He obtained new and numerous conversions, in consequence of which having been brought before the tribunal of the same tyrant, he openly confessed the faith of Christ, and despising the magnificent offers which were made to him, to induce him for once to invoke the name of the idol, without being terrified at menaces, without yielding to blows, he was condemned, out of hatred to the faith, to be beheaded; and consequently endured martyrdom on the day before the nones of February, in the year 1693. The fame of the holiness of this most illustrious martyr having been spread abroad through the Indies, and God confirming it by miracles, the Ordinary of Madura in the first instance, and on his example those of Cochin-China and of Goa, prepared judicial informations, to which having added all that is customary, a preparatory meeting of the Congregation of Sacred Rites was held on the calends of July, in the year 1738, in the palace of the reporter, the Most Reverend Cardinal of San Clemente, to examine the dubium:—*An constet de martyrio et causâ martyris in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.*

And as in this congregation a doubt was raised on the question of discovering whether the Ven. John had not used during his missions, contrary to the prescriptions of the Church, certain pagan rites, Pope Clement XII., of holy memory, judged it expedient to submit the examination of this article to the supreme tribunal of the Holy Inquisition. The Pontiff died before a sentence was given. His successor, Pope Benedict XII. of holy memory, who, before his elevation to the Holy See, had discharged the functions of promoter of the faith in the preliminaries of this cause, and those of consultor refendary to the Holy Inquisition in this disputed point, having called up the cause by a *motu proprio*, ordered that the Congregation of Sacred Rites should assemble before him on the tenth day of the calends of May, in the year 1741, to examine the dubium: *An obstant objecti ritus quominus procedi possit ad ulteriora in casu, et ad effectum de quo agitur?* He consequently heard the objections of the promoter of the faith, collected the advice of each of the Cardinals, and having read, examined, and very attentively weighed both the one and the other, as it was plain that this saint had not used the rites in question in the manner of the Gentiles, who attached to them a superstitious value, but that he had simply accommodated himself to them as to the common practices of civil life; the Pontiff having furthermore prayed much, and celebrated the holy mysteries, delivered, on the sixth day of the nones of July in the same year, the following decree:—"The rites objected by the promoter of the faith do not forbid, in the present cause, our proceeding onwards—to wit, to the discussions touching the dubium of martyrdom, the cause of the martyr, and the signs or miracles obtained, according to public rumour, by the prayers of the servant of God."

These difficulties having been disposed of, the discussion on the dubium itself was about to be opened in a preparatory meeting, when all at once, in the kingdom of Portugal, that storm broke out by which the Company of Jesus were there struck, and close upon which those vicissitudes followed by which it was every where overwhelmed. Every obstacle having afterwards ceased, the meeting was held in the Vatican, in the presence of the Most Reverend Fathers set over the sacred rites, on the sixth day of the ides of April in the present year; and lastly, in fine, on the 17th day of the calends of October, the question having been resumed in a general assembly, in the presence of our Most Holy Father Pope Pius IX., where, in the absence of the Most Reverend Cardinal Della Geuga-Sermattei, reporter, the Most Reverend Cardinal Aloysius Lambruschini having proposed the cause, the Most Reverend Cardinals and the other Fathers each gave their suffrages.

After having attentively heard them, the Most Holy Father deferred pronouncing his judgment, and dismissing the assembly in terms full of goodness, he exhorted every one to offer up unto God humble and fervent prayers; a duty of which he acquitted himself the first. Afterwards, on the day consecrated to the Prince of the celestial host, whose strength the Ven. John imitated in labouring for so many years in propagating religion, and in confessing the name of Jesus Christ, his Holiness offered the victim of the new alliance, again implored the aid of the divine light, and having betaken himself to the apostolical residence, situated on the banks of the Tiber, after having there fulfilled, like a vigilant pastor, the secondary duties of his office, he called before him the Most Reverend Cardinal Aloysius Lambruschini, Bishop of Porto, Santa Rufina, and Civita Vecchia, Prefect of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, as also the Rev. Father Andrea-Maria Frattini, Promoter of the Faith, with me, the undersigned secretary, and in their presence he canonically

pronounced:—"Certainty has been attained of the martyrdom, and of the cause of martyrdom, of the venerable servant of God, John de Britto, illustrated and confirmed by God by many prodigies; wherefore we have security in proceeding in this cause to ulterior measures, and to pass on to the discussion of miracles other than the prodigies already proposed and examined in the congregations above indicated."

And his Holiness ordered that this decree should be published and inserted in the acts of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, on the 3d of the calends of October, in the year MDCCCLI.

A Card. LAMBRUSCHINI,

*Bishop of Porto, Santa Ruffina, and Civita Vecchia,
Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.*

G. FATALI, Secretary of the S. R. C.

Loco ✠ sigilli.

NEW INDULGENCES FOR THE RECITATION OF THE CHAPLET.

DECRETUM URBI ET ORBI.

[Translation.]

At an audience of the Most Holy Father, on the 12th of May, 1851.

IN order always more and more to augment in the hearts of the faithful the devotion towards the Virgin, Mother of God, and, above all, by the most efficacious prayer of the most holy Rosary, in which are also recalled the mysteries of our redemption, our most holy Father Pope Pius IX., favourably receiving the most humble prayers of the Vicar-General and of the Procurator-General of the whole order of the Friars-Preachers, after having confirmed all the indulgences granted by his glorious predecessors, as well to the members of the confraternities of the most holy Rosary as to all the faithful who should recite the Rosary, has deigned to attach new indulgences to the recitation of that prayer, both for the members of confraternities and for the other faithful. For the brethren and sisters of all the confraternities canonically instituted, or which may hereafter be instituted, plenary indulgence on the days of the Conception, of the Nativity, of the Annunciation, of the Visitation, of the Purification, and of the Assumption of the holy Virgin Mary, on two Fridays of Lent only, left to the choice of each person; on the Sunday of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; on the day of Pentecost—provided that, being truly penitent, having confessed, and received the nourishment of the Holy Communion, they visit devoutly some church on that day, from the first Vespers to sunset, and for some space of time there offer pious prayers for the intentions of his Holiness. Indulgences of ten years and of ten quarantains to be gained once a day by the members of confraternities and the other faithful, who, being at least contrite in heart, shall devoutly recite in common the third part of the Rosary, whether at their house, or in the churches or in oratories, public or private. Lastly, the faithful who do not belong to this confraternity, if they are in the habit of reciting the third part of the Rosary at least thrice a week, will gain the plenary indulgence on the last Sunday of each month, provided that, being truly penitent, as required above, having confessed, and approached the holy table, they visit some church or public oratory, and pray there for some time for the inten-

tions above mentioned. The will of his Holiness is, that all and every of the aforesaid indulgences are not only applicable to the souls in purgatory, but available in perpetuity for the time to come, without any forwarding of Brief; any disposition to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome from the Secretariate of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences.

F. CARD. ASQUINI, Prefect.
ALOYSIUS COLOMBO, Sec.

SPEECH OF THE REV. ROBERT MULLEN ON THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

THE Rev. Robert Mullen of Clonmellon having been appointed to visit America for the purpose of making collections for the new University, has been entertained at a public dinner at Kells, previous to his departure. The speech he made on the occasion is one of the most remarkable and plain-spoken declarations of principle which has yet appeared, and well deserves preserving. We give it nearly entire. It was received by the audience with enthusiasm:

"You understand what a University is. 'Tis a place for general education, where the various arts and faculties are taught by competent masters—where degrees of merit are conferred on the students; and when all this is done in accordance with the principles of the Church, it is a Catholic University. There is a University at Dublin, but 'tis not Catholic; on the contrary, it is uncatholic, for it excludes from its honours, from its chairs and places of trust, all who profess the religion of the people. Within its unhallowed walls hundreds have been from time to time perverted, losing altogether the gift of faith; and such as have preserved it have left it with a weakened faith; and hence, if we look to some of the Catholic gentry in Ireland, what are they? They acknowledge a Church, but practically deny her authority in matters of morals and discipline. They come from these hotbeds of infidelity and irreligion filled with latitudinarian principles; professing Catholics as long as it accords with their pride or interests, but practical infidels when pride is wounded or interests interfered with. Observe them at public places scandalising the faithful by the open violation of principle and precept, setting at nought the law of God, and setting up in its place their own will—the law of their desires. Consider their conduct on these occasions, where the Church might justly calculate on their generous aid—their individual allegiance, and how do they comport themselves? They join the enemies of their faith, the scoffers and haters of their religion, and abandon that which they are bound to defend. Educated with libertines, with men who laugh and mock at all moral restraint, with men who maintain that faith without works will save,—educated, I say, thus, they have no fixed principle to guide them, and, as a necessary consequence, they are professing Catholics, but political infidels. And mind, the evil does not end with themselves. We are creatures of imitation; so some of the farmers and peasantry curse and blaspheme like the gentry, mock religion like the gentry, abandon principle like the gentry, ally themselves with the enemies of religion like the gentry; in one word, the evil example of the superior extends to the inferior or humbler classes, and thus is society perverted, that you have no longer a people united for good, but a divided people, ready to sell themselves for filthy lucre or self-aggrandisement to any

minister who will bid for them. This you may think an overwrought description; but to any man who takes care to reflect it will appear a true one. It is an unsound state, and one that requires a remedy; and as the evil has arisen from vitiated education, from the corruption inseparable from evil associations, it follows as a natural consequence that the cure is to be found in a healthy Catholic education, such as the Episcopacy of Ireland wish to secure through a Catholic University. Yes, as the Bishops say, a Catholic University would also impart a higher tone to the Catholic body; it would diffuse Catholic notions through the mass of society; it would create a greater interest in all that concerns the welfare of the Catholic religion; it would encourage a taste for Catholic literature, Catholic arts, Catholic institutions of every sort; it would create a large body of learned men, who would exercise an important influence on society; men competent, on the one hand, to vindicate the cause of religion against the insidious attacks of a mis-called but dangerous science, and, on the other, to rescue science from the use to which it has been perverted, by dissociating it from, and even turning it against, religion; it would educate every one to that lofty Catholic principle, that religion is a consideration paramount to every other, and therefore never to be compromised in order to purchase any temporal advantage whatever. In these, and many ways besides, a Catholic University would serve as a grand centre for diffusing the living principle of Faith through the whole Catholic body, and communicating its vivifying influence to the most distant and least important parts. There is in man two kinds of life, the moral and natural; the former having its birth and progress as well as the latter. A child deformed at its birth will, generally speaking, be so during life; the same is true in the moral life. If a man be morally deformed, or trained to vice in youth, he will be so when old; and there is more than human authority for this—‘Train up a child in the way he should go, even in old age he will not depart from it;’ and Job says ‘that the vices of his youth will sleep with him in the dust.’ And passing from sacred to profane history, Plato says, ‘There is nothing more divine than to form children to virtue.’ Aristotle writes, ‘that all depends on the education of children, whether as regards individuals or the entire commonwealth, for good customs are the fruit of a plant well cultivated and of a youth well disciplined.’ The prosperity and happiness of every country depends on a sound religious education; and it was in this sense the philosopher called youth ‘the blood of the state.’ The Greeks selected the most learned as teachers for youth. The Persians chose the most virtuous and learned for the office of teachers. Seneca would require in teachers ‘great perfection and wisdom.’ It was only reserved for our times and legislators to invent godless systems, which set at naught the natural wisdom of the Pagan philosophers as well as the sublime teachings of the Christian preacher. And if we look around, have we not melancholy proofs of the evils which have arisen from the separation of education from the sacred influence of religion? In France, in Germany, and in other countries, the State foolishly interfered, separated religion from science, laid down systems and theories without the groundwork—religion. What ensued? The blackened pages of continental history can tell. Infidelity rushed on like a torrent of burning lava, desolating in its destructive course all that was green and beautiful. Thrones were upturned, dynasties annihilated, altars overthrown, society shattered, and the scaffolds reeked with the blood of the purest and noblest in the land. Yes, my friends, religion—religious education—is ever the support of law, the preserver of order and authority. Remove

this, and you have, as after Voltaire and Diderot, unsound philosophy, wild theories, subversive of all those salutary restraints which religion imposes. What folly, what madness, in the government here to follow in the baneful track that brought in the past century destruction on the nations of Europe! How ridiculously absurd to offer us, as a boon, what must and ought to be looked on as a great unmitigated evil—the taking away the youth of Ireland from the protecting influence of religion! It is evident their object is not the ostensible one—instruction; but rather the clumsily concealed one—perversion. They gild the poisoned pill, and offer it; but, thanks to God, the Catholics of Ireland have indignantly rejected it. Nor let it be said the Bishops are leaving their province in this matter; for to them, and not to the State, was given the high authority, ‘go and teach all nations.’ It was their duty—I mean the Bishops—to attend to education; and indeed, they have at all times nobly and zealously discharged this sacred trust. From the earliest times the Church has, through her Bishops, priests, and seculars, instructed her children; she founded religious establishments, schools, and colleges for the instruction of youth; she placed herself between barbarism and civilisation. When the former came from the north of Europe, she saved literature from utter extinction. As in the earlier ages she resisted the barbarism; so in the middle ages she, through her monasteries, preserved the monuments of science and Christianity. And, in latter ages, her veriest enemies cannot deny that the greatest Universities of the world were founded and endowed by her children, when faith was pure and charity unlimited, when the English schism was unknown and the heresy of Luther unheard of. It is an unfounded imputation, a gross calumny, for any man or men to assert that the Church is opposed to the diffusion of knowledge. History is replete with facts sufficient to upturn this vile invention of man to dim the lustre of the Church’s glory. And the Irish Church, when England placed a bar upon education, contrived amidst every danger to secure her most efficient aid to diffuse knowledge; but not the knowledge that destroys, but that which leads to life. She opposed at all times, she opposes now, and, ever true to her sacred and sublime trust, will continue to oppose such systems as tend to destroy youth—new-fangled, impious, godless systems—such as the Bishop of Malines condemns—such as are condemned by every bishop who understands his duty and is zealous to fulfil it. Mixed systems, no matter what precautions you take, are ever dangerous. We believe we possess, and we alone, the true faith; ours is an essentially exclusive religion. We believe that out of our Church there is no true faith, no abiding hope, no charity having an eternal reward. We believe our faith to be divine, our doctrine pure as the crystallised water; we believe, and we know, that admixture spoils, weakens, and, in some instances, destroys faith; we believe there can be no communion between God and Belial, and that our doctrines are as opposite to those of the sectaries as light is to darkness. And then, why should any government ask us to mix, and thus render impure what was pellucid before? They (the government) have an object, and that is to pervert us. That was their object in founding Queen’s Colleges; that is their purpose in upholding them. If they really wished, as they profess, to afford facility for education to the respectable classes, why not make the northern a purely Presbyterian college—the Cork and Galway Catholic colleges, Dublin having its Protestant college? Let the Protestant have his children strict Protestants, the Presbyterians equally strict, and leave us a like liberty to educate our youth according to what we believe the pure dogmas of that faith which is of God and eternal.

And now, my friends, let me tell you this, that even were all the professors in the Queen's Colleges Catholics, were they even non-government Catholics, but men appointed by our prelates, I say the colleges would be imperfect if others than Catholics were admitted. And what finally determined the Pope on the college question? Was it not a memorial presented to the Holy See by the Hungarian Bishops, representing the evil effects of the mixture of pupils in Hungarian schools and colleges, even with all the professors and teachers Catholic? What, then, must be the danger here, while the professors are all the nominees of a Protestant anti-Catholic government, the head whereof is the writer of the infamous 'Durham epistle,' who would style all the ceremonies of our Church superstitious mummeries? I say to you, that the question of education is the great vital question; give us a youth properly trained in science, religiously instructed—give us a Catholic University where religion is not ignored, but where 'tis the foundation, where it is directive of science as a handmaid, and you change the face of things at once; you will have society, not as now divided, but united on every question useful to the country. But some Catholics say, 'Oh, sir, I know what you say is all right, but you know 'tis hard to go against the government, they have so much wealth, and power, and sources of corruption.' Others will say, 'Well, I think you are right speculatively, but come to facts, and are not some Bishops and priests on the other side, and the Pope was misled;' and some go so far as to say, 'You can't succeed.' If I am not detaining you too long, I will answer these objections; and to begin with the last—'impossible.' We know no such word. Have not the Irish people, when robbed of their churches and plundered of their property, raised within the past forty years mighty temples to glorify their religion and their God, many of which would put to shame the puny conventicles of their Protestant brethren? Have they not built public seminaries and colleges in Navan, Armagh, Clogher, Derry, Tuam, Carlow, Thurles, Clongowes, Castleknock, and All Hallows? Who built these? Who supported them? Ireland. Yes, Ireland, poor, but religious Catholic Ireland. And if we pass from the present to the past, do we not behold the venerable ruins of her ancient colleges, when the learning of her children brought strangers to study here, when we had such men as Finian, and Cataldus, and Scotus; and shall it be said now that we, in the nineteenth century, cannot do what our sainted forefathers did in times of greater difficulty? There is no impossibility to a determined people. Well, the second objection, 'that the Bishops and priests are divided—that the successor of Peter was misinformed.' Why, if ever there was a question placed clearly before the chair of authority, it was the University question. First, by its friends, who explained fully the good of unmixed, the evil of mixed education. Secondly, by the enemies of the University—the government agents of the day. They sent accredited agents to Rome, selected from the Catholic episcopacy and priesthood—men having minds stored with knowledge, intimately conversant with the question in all its bearings—men of nice address, polished to perfection, acute logicians, and having on their side the weight of spiritual as well as government authority. Why, sir, it would be a calumny on these agents (not of God, but of man) to suppose they neglected the business of their masters. So Rome had all the information on both sides, and, moreover, the opinions of her Cardinals, and of all the Bishops of Christendom. The Pope had, therefore, the necessary information, and it would be contrary to faith to say he had not light, or erred; for Christ assures us to the contrary, in saying that hell shall not prevail against him; and he has spoken emphatically in two

rescripts; and he, moreover, reminds the Bishops of the duty of building a University; and he has done this, having melancholy experience from the countries of Europe of the evils of mixed education. Now, what is your duty and mine? What is the duty of every Christian when Rome has spoken as she has by two authoritative rescripts? I will tell you in the words of St. Jerome—‘Whoever is united to the Chair of Peter is mine,’ and I defy any man, be he professor or bishop, to answer that argument, or to assert that the quotation is inapplicable. For when Jerome went to Damascus the Church of Antioch was divided, or disturbed, by rival claims of three bishops, each claiming the adhesion of the faithful, just as the Irish Bishops are divided now between Rome on the one side, Clarendon, Lord John, and the murdering Whigs on the other. And who was Jerome for? For Rome certainly; for him united to the Chair of Peter. Do you imitate this great doctor, and join Rome and the Bishops, in whose favour Rome has spoken by authentic documents: Fix your eye on Rome, and remember these words of Jerome, ‘Whoever does not gather with you scatters—that is, whoever is not of Christ is of Antichrist.’—Now, I tell you those who are favouring these godless institutions, who are apathetic in reference to the founding of a University for the Catholic youth of Ireland, are, as much as in them lies, scattering what is of God and favouring Antichrist. The Bishops who stand aloof necessarily prolong and widen division in the Church, and they thus deprive the nation of the power of wresting from the British Minister any one important benefit for our religion or our country. If the Bishops, and the priests, and the people, had remained a compact and united body, would we ever be reduced to the frightful state in which we find ourselves at present? Would the Whigs have so brutally neglected our poor people? Would they have dared to subject us to religious persecution? Would they have declined regulating the relations between landlord and tenant? Would they have continued to force their infidel colleges on the Catholic people of Ireland? No! the divisions of the Catholic body, particularly the Bishops, have been the cause of all the calamities which have befallen us; and if they continue, other disasters await us. I say now, that any Catholic layman who in deference to the views of a few Bishops and a couple dozen of priests, withholds his support from the University, promotes (as far as in him lies) the evils I have been enumerating. There remains yet one objection, the power of the government. To this I would say—God’s arm is not shortened; and when He is with us, what avails their power? The government and ministry were against the Belgians, forcing upon them a mixed and unhallowed system of education; and history tells us, that instead of succeeding, the dynasty of Nassau fell; the star of Leopold was in the ascendant; proving my position, that if God be with us, who shall be against us? The government has great means and sources of corruption; but if the Catholics of Ireland be true to themselves, we shall succeed.”

END OF VOLUME VIII.





